## **Politics Disad – Jackson-Vanik**

### Jackson-Vanik 1NC Shell

#### **Jackson-Vanik will pass- momentum growing in Congress to pass within two months**

Financial Times 6/12

(James Politi, staffwriter for the Financial Times, 6/12/12, “Moscow trade move on US agenda”, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/0386cc9c-b4b1-11e1-aa06-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1z7l9Dp7z”)

Momentum is growing in Congress for legislation to normalize US trade relations with Russia in connection with its looming accession to the World Trade Organization. A bipartisan group of influential senators on Tuesday introduced a bill that would grant “permanent normal trade relations” status to Russia, calling for fellow lawmakers to approve the legislation over the next two months. The bill – sponsored by Max Baucus, the chairman of the Senate finance committee – would also repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment, a provision of US law designed in the 1970s to restrict trade with countries that restrict emigration. “Jackson-Vanik served its purpose during the cold war, but it’s a relic of another era that now stands in the way of our farmers, ranchers and businesses pursuing opportunities to grow and create jobs,” said Mr Baucus. “We owe it to American workers and businesses to enable them to take advantage of the doors opening in Russia.” The move comes amid persistent concerns harboured by many US lawmakers about Russia’s foreign policy – particularly with regard to Syria – as well as the pace of political and economic reforms, and human rights in the country. In fact, Mr Baucus said he planned to introduce an amendment to the PNTR legislation called the “Magnitsky” bill – which is opposed by Russia – allowing the US to freeze assets and deny entry to Russian officials deemed responsible for human rights abuses. The Obama administration has said it would prefer a “clean” bill, not tying PNTR with the Magnitsky rule, but nonetheless “welcomed” the introduction of the legislation in the Senate. “We will continue to work with Congress so that Americans can reap the full benefits of Russia’s WTO membership,” said Ron Kirk, US trade representative.

#### PC key to repeal votes on Jackson Vanik

Moscow Times ‘12

“Margelov Hopes Jackson-Vanik Will Be Repealed in 2012”,4/5/12 http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/margelov-hopes-jackson-vanik-will-be-repealed-in-2012/456160.html, BJM

The United States will raise the issue of discussing the Jackson-Vanik amendment before this summer, said Mikhail Margelov, head of the Federation Council's International Affairs Committee, Interfax reported. "The administration of President Barack Obama, which has been lobbying this issue in Congress, is synchronizing watches and taking stock of its forces," Margelov told reporters after a round table that focused on the reversal of the amendment in the context of Russia's accession to the World Trade Organization. The event was held behind closed doors. Margelov said Ambassador Michael McFaul has been participating in the round-table process. It is important for the Obama administration to understand how many votes it can secure in Congress for the decision to repeal the amendment, which was passed during the Cold War era and which limits trading opportunities between Russia and the United States, the senator said. The issue is "a matter of the U.S. internal calendar," he said. "For us, it is interesting only from the standpoint that the reversal of this amendment will become a political signal that the relics of the Cold War will be removed from our political realities and the reset will be filled with substance," Margelov said. For the first time, the U.S. presidential administration "has been lobbying the reversal of this amendment genuinely and deeply, and has been doing so very seriously and professionally," he said.

#### Anything above routine investment costs political capital

Freemark ‘12

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “On Infrastructure, Hopes for Progress This Year Look Glum” – January 25th, 2012 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/

President Obama barely mentions the need for improvements in the nation’s capital stock in his State of the Union. The contributions of the Obama Administration to the investment in improved transportation alternatives have been significant, but it was clear from the President’s State of the Union address last night that 2012 will be a year of diminished expectations in the face of a general election and a tough Congressional opposition. Mr. Obama’s address, whatever its merits from a populist perspective, nonetheless failed to propose dramatic reforms to encourage new spending on transportation projects, in contrast to previous years. While the Administration has in some ways radically reformed the way Washington goes about selecting capital improvements, bringing a new emphasis on livability and underdeveloped modes like high-speed rail, there was little indication in the speech of an effort to expand such policy choices. All that we heard was a rather meek suggestion to transform a part of the money made available from the pullout from the Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts — a sort of war dividend whose size is undefined — to “do some nation-building right here at home.” If these suggestions fell flat for the pro-investment audience, they were reflective of the reality of working in the context of a deeply divided political system in which such once-universally supported policies as increased roads funding have become practically impossible to pursue. Mr. Obama pushed hard, we shouldn’t forget, for a huge, transformational transportation bill in early 2011, only to be rebuffed by intransigence in the GOP-led House of Representatives and only wavering support in the Democratic Senate. For the first term at least, the Administration’s transportation initiatives appear to have been pushed aside. Even so, it remains to be seen how the Administration will approach the development of a transportation reauthorization program. Such legislation remains on the Congressional agenda after three years of delays (the law expires on March 31st). There is so far no long-term solution to the continued inability of fuel tax revenues to cover the growing national need for upgraded or expanded mobility infrastructure. But if it were to pass, a new multi-year transportation bill would be the most significant single piece of legislation passed by the Congress in 2012. The prospect of agreement between the two parties on this issue, however, seems far-fetched. That is, if we are to assume that the goal is to complete a new and improved spending bill, rather than simply further extensions of the existing legislation. The House could consider this month a bill that would fund new highways and transit for several more years by expanding domestic production of heavily carbon-emitting fossil fuels, a terrible plan that would produce few new revenues and encourage more ecological destruction. Members of the Senate, meanwhile, have for months been claiming they were “looking” for the missing $12 or 13 billion to complete its new transportation package but have so far come up with bupkis. The near-term thus likely consists of either continued extensions of the current law or a bipartisan bargain that fails to do much more than replicate the existing law, perhaps with a few bureaucratic reforms.

#### The recent highways bill doesn’t take out the disad—they decreased baseline levels of spending

The Hill 6/29

"Congress passes highway funds, extends lower student loan rate" By Pete Kasperowicz and Daniel Strauss - 06/29/12, thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/house/235621-house-passes-highway-student-loan-flood-insurance-bill AD 6/29/12

The vote also ends a long streak without a long-term highway bill. The last transportation bill that was approved by Congress was supposed to expire in September 2009, when former Democratic Rep. Jim Oberstar (D-Minn.) ran the Transportation Committee in the House. Instead, the measure was temporarily extended nine times, including the latest three-month appropriation that was scheduled to expire on Saturday. The scope of the new transportation legislation has been reduced since the last time Congress approved a multiyear highway bill. The last bill, which was signed into law in 2005 by former President George W. Bush, lasted four years and spent $244 billion on road and transit projects.

#### Jackson-Vanik repeal sets the tone for US-Russia relations

Gvosdev 12

Nikolas, faculty of the U.S. Naval War College “The Realist Prism: Resetting the U.S.-Russia Reset,” http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11441/the-realist-prism-resetting-the-u-s-russia-reset

An upcoming decision-point could offer a good indication of what to expect. The World Trade Organization is expected to ratify Russia’s accession later this spring. However, American firms will not be able to take advantage of Russia's WTO membership as long as U.S. trade with Russia is still subject to the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik amendment. Congress would first have to agree to "graduate" Russia from the terms of the legislation, but many members remain hesitant. An unofficial swap would see Russia given permanent normal trading relations status, but with new legislation applying "smart sanctions" against specific Russian individuals and entities accused of condoning human rights abuses, most notably in the death of Russian lawyer Sergei Magnitsky. Whether this Solomonic compromise could work, however, remains to be seen. The Russian government has already responded very negatively to sanctions unilaterally imposed by the State Department and may be quite unwilling to accept such a compromise, even if it means graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik. At the same time, there remains resistance within Congress to "giving up" one of its last remaining tools to pressure Russia on a whole range of issues, from chicken imports to religious freedom. The fate of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, therefore, is the canary in the coal mine for U.S.-Russia relations. If a successful repeal is negotiated, it bodes well for regenerating the relationship. However, if Obama, like George W. Bush before him, is unable to secure Russia’s graduation, this could end up being a fatal blow to the whole idea of the reset.

#### Russian relations are key to solve every impact-alternative is crisis escalation and war

Commission on US Policy Toward Russia 2009

(US Senate, “THE RIGHT DIRECTION FOR U.S. POLICY TOWARD RUSSIA,”  March)

Securing America’s vital national interests in the complex, interconnected, and interdependent world of the twenty-first century requires deep and meaningful cooperation with other governments. The challenges—stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, defeating terrorist networks, rebuilding the global economy, and ensuring energy security for the United States and others—are enormous. And few nations could make more of a difference to our success than Russia, with its vast arsenal of nuclear weapons, its strategic location spanning Europe and Asia, its considerable energy resources, and its status as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council. Rapid and effective action to strengthen U.S.-Russian relations is critically important to advancing U.S. national interests An American commitment to improving U.S.-Russian relations is neither a reward to be offered for good international behavior by Moscow nor an endorsement of the Russian government’s domestic conduct. Rather, it is an acknowledgement of the importance of Russian cooperation in achieving essential American goals, whether preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, dismantling al- Qaeda and stabilizing Afghanistan, or guaranteeing security and prosperity in Europe. Success in creating a new and cooperative relationship with Russia can contribute to each of these objectives and many others. Failure could impose significant costs.

## \*\*\*Uniqueness\*\*\*

### Jackson-Vanik Will Pass

#### **Jackson-Vanik will pass- bipartisan support, support of the USDA and the US has empirically made exceptions for trades with Russia, making J-V outdated**

Sorensen 6/27

(Loretta Sprensen, reporter for the Midwest Producer, 6/27/12, “Vilsack: Repeal Jackson-Vanik amendment or lose trade with Russia”, http://www.midwestproducer.com/news/markets/vilsack-repeal-jackson-vanik-amendment-or-lose-trade-with-russia/article\_dc5cff3e-c07b-11e1-a016-0019bb2963f4.html)

In the process of approving Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) with Russia, Congress must pass a short and simple bill that grants Russia PNTR status and repeals Jackson-Vanik. Failure to do so will mean the U.S. will be in violation of WTO rules once Russia becomes a WTO member. Through Russia's WTO membership, Moscow will be required to enact a host of economic reforms that will further open the Russian market to U.S. goods and services and provide a process for addressing any future unfair or unsupported trade barriers that might arise. In an address to the U.S. Senate Committee on Finance on June 21, 2012, Vilsack noted that the USDA strongly supports establishing PNTR with Russia and ensuring that Russia remains one of the U.S. top export markets as it joins WTO. "PNTR is not a favor to Russia," Vilsack said. "It is a significant opportunity for America's farmers, ranchers and producers. It will provide improved, predictable access to Russia's 140 million consumers and an expanding middle class that has grown by more than 50 percent in the last decade." Vilsack explained that the U.S. has been extending market access to Russia since 1992 on an annual basis. U.S. agricultural exports to Russia in fiscal year 2011 were nearly $1.4 billion, contributing significantly to the U.S. agricultural trade surplus. The U.S. imported only $25 million of agricultural products from Russia in 2011. As part of its WTO membership agreement, Russia will reduce tariffs on a number of agricultural products. Soybean tariffs will be at zero. For soybean meal, tariffs will be reduced from 5 percent to 2.5 percent. Maximum bound tariffs on most cheeses will drop from 25 percent to 15 percent within three years. Russia's duties are already relatively low for many fruits and tree nuts, but those rates will be bound and, in many cases, reduced substantially within a few years of accession. Through the Russian WTO membership, U.S. farmers will have more certain and predictable market access, Russia will be obligated to apply its trade regime in a manner consistent with WTO rules, and they will be obligated to follow detailed rules governing transparency in development of trade policies and measures. Compliance with Russia's obligations will be enforceable through use of the WTO dispute settlement process. "I believe Jackson-Vanik will be repealed," Vilsack said. "There is bipartisan support for the repeal. I believe members of Congress realize farmers, ranchers and producers will be at a serious disadvantage if the repeal doesn't happen. We can't cede that much territory to our competitors."

#### Magnitsky last hurdle to passage—should occur next month

Cassata 6/26

(Donna Cassata, reporter from the Modesto Bee, 6/26/12, “Senate panel OKs bill on Russian human rights, http://www.modbee.com/2012/06/26/2258347/senate-panel-oks-bill-on-russian.html#storylink=cpy)

A Senate panel moved ahead Tuesday on legislation that would impose tough sanctions on Russian human rights violators, a bill certain to be linked to congressional efforts to lift Cold War-era restrictions on trade with Russia. By voice vote, the Foreign Relations Committee approved the measure that would impose visa bans and freeze the assets of those held responsible for gross human rights violations in Russia as well as other human rights abusers. Specifically, it targets those allegedly involved in the imprisonment, torture and death of lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, who died in a Russian jail in 2009. The bill, sponsored by Sen. Ben Cardin, enjoys strong bipartisan support in the Senate. The Maryland Democrat said he was optimistic that the House would accept his more far-reaching version. The House Foreign Affairs Committee approved a similar bill earlier this month. "This bill is universal," Cardin told reporters shortly after the vote. "It's absolutely motivated by Sergei Magnitsky, but it's universal in its application."The Russian government has expressed strong objections to the bill and suggested that there would be retaliatory measures if it becomes law.The Obama administration has been noncommittal in its public statements about the measure. During brief discussion of the legislation, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry, D-Mass., noted Russia's record of accomplishments and missteps. He said the United States shouldn't always be the one pointing fingers at other nations, but added, "Human rights is in our DNA." The bill was designed to publicize the names of the offenders. But the measure does allow the secretary of state to classify the names based on national security. Cardin offered an amendment that requires the administration to explain annually why it is classifying the names. In an odd turn, Kerry expressed concern that with the recent leaks of classified information, the names could be released. After some debate, the panel adopted Cardin's amendment by voice vote. Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus, D-Mont., has said he would add the human rights legislation to a bipartisan measure to normalize trade relations with Russia, a move that could occur next month. That bill would repeal the 1974 Jackson-Vanik act that tied trade with the then-Soviet Union to Moscow's allowing Jews and other minorities to leave the country. The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is necessary if U.S. businesses are to enjoy the lower tariffs and increased access to Russian markets that will become available when Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer. Supporters of normalized trade said it could lead to a doubling of U.S. exports to Russia. Separately, Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., sent a letter to President Barack Obama on Tuesday asking him to determine whether to impose sanctions against the Klyuev Group. McCain called the group a "dangerous transnational criminal organization" and suggested it may have been involved in the murder of Magnitsky.

#### **Jackson-Vanik will pass- legislators and the Obama administration are already looking ahead, implying passage**

RT News 6/13

(RT News, news agency, 6/13/12, “Lifting of Russia-US trade barriers faces opposition”, http://rt.com/business/news/us-opposes-lifting-restrictions-russia-trade-jackson-vanik-699/)

A US Senate plan to lift Cold War restrictions on trade with Russia faced opposition from Senate Republicans who said Congress must first address Russia's poor human rights record and existing economic and political policies. A group of US senators introduced legislation on Tuesday to lift trade restrictions on Russia. The bill is hoped to be passed before Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer. The 1974 Jackson-Vanik Act tied trade with the then-Soviet Union to Moscow allowing Jews and other minorities to leave Russia. The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is seen as beneficial for US businesses which seek lower tariffs and access to Russian markets once the country joins the WTO. "This is an opportunity to double our exports to Russia and create thousands of jobs across every sector of the U.S. economy, all at no cost to the U.S. whatsoever," said Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus in a statement. According to the Senator, "Jackson-Vanik served its purpose during the Cold War, but it's a relic of another era that now stands in the way of our farmers, ranchers and businesses pursuing opportunities to grow and create jobs". However, Baucus also vowed to incorporate provisions being championed by an increasing number of Democrats and Republicans to punish Russian officials for any human-rights violations. Mr. Baucus said that once the Senate passes the bill, he would work with the House to ensure any final version of the legislation includes the full text of the so-called "Magnitsky" bill, named after a lawyer who died in a Russian prison in 2009 after accusing government officials of fraud. Administration officials have called for Congress to pass the trade bill separately from any human-rights legislation. In case the amendment is cancelled Russia-US trade relations will be regulated by WTO rules once Russia joins the organization.

#### Jackson Vanik will pass – bipartisan support of congress and interest groups gives momentum

Agence France Presse, 6/12

[“US senators introduce bill to end trade curbs on Russia”, Lexis, BJM]

A bipartisan group of US senators introduced legislation Tuesday that would scrap a decades-old law imposing trade restrictions on Moscow, saying it's necessary as Russia joins the WTO. Washington's former Cold War adversary has been given the green light to join the World Trade Organization, which means the Russian and US governments will need to grant each other permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) by the time the accession is complete. Washington would need to lift a 1974 law, the Jackson-Vanik amendment, under which normal trade relations are granted to Russia only on an annual basis. "This is an opportunity to double our exports to Russia and create thousands of jobs across every sector of the US economy, all at no cost to the US whatsoever," said Democrat Max Baucus, who chairs the Senate Finance Committee. "Jackson-Vanik served its purpose during the Cold War, but it's a relic of another era that now stands in the way of our farmers, ranchers and businesses pursuing opportunities to grow and create jobs," he added. Republican co-sponsor John Thune noted that presidents from both parties have been granting Russia normal trade status annually since 1992. "It is time to establish this treatment on a permanent basis so that American farmers, manufacturers, investors, and service providers will have the ability to take full advantage of the new business opportunities resulting from Russia's entry into the WTO" later this summer, he said. US business groups support the lifting of Jackson-Vanik, as Russian WTO membership will allow US companies to take advantage of additional market access, greater intellectual property enforcement and lower Russian agriculture subsidies. "Passing this bill will ensure that US businesses, ranchers, farmers and workers will not be at a disadvantage in the Russian market compared to their global competitors," US Trade Representative Ron Kirk said in a statement welcoming the legislation. US exports to Russia total about $9 billion per year, with some studies showing that the figure could double within five years after Russia earns PNTR status. Also backing the legislation were Senator John McCain as well as John Kerry, who called on Congress to pass the new bill so that the United States is not left on the sidelines while other nations benefit from favorable treatment in the Russian market. "We cannot afford to dither, delay, and deny ourselves the job creation and major export opportunities that come from passing PNTR," Kerry said.

### Top of Agenda/Obama Pushing

#### **Jackson-Vanik is at the top of the agenda- Congress, Obama and other groups are pushing to have it passed as soon as possible**

The Hill 6/10

(Vicki Needhman, columnist for The Hill, 6/10/12, “Human rights concerns complicate efforts to ramp up Russia trade”, http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/231947-human-rights-concerns-complicate-efforts-to-ramp-up-russia-trade)

Congress, the Obama administration and business groups are ramping up efforts to pave the way this summer for improved trade relations with Russia, but that work is being complicated by parallel efforts to address human rights concerns in that country. While the push is being made to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment and grant permanent normal trade relations, some lawmakers are also eager to pass a measure designed to signal to Moscow that human rights and national security violations won't be tolerated as that nation prepares to join the World Trade Organization (WTO). In the ever complicated realm of U.S.-Russia relations, supporters of repealing Jackson-Vanik — a 37-year-old provision designed to put pressure on Communist nations for human-rights abuses and emigration policies — are emphasizing that Russia's entry into the WTO does not require the U.S. to pass any additional measures . "The United States gives up nothing and won't be required to change its laws," said Edward Gerwin, senior fellow for trade and global economic policy at Third Way, told The Hill.

#### **Jackson-Vanik is a priority- both democratic and republican senior officials have given their support and pushing for its passage**

Reuters 6/12

(Doug Palmer, Reuters columnist, 6/12/12, “Senators pair Russia trade, human rights bills”, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-06-12/news/sns-rt-us-usa-russia-tradebre85b0w6-20120612\_1\_human-rights-jackson-vanik-top-trade-priority)

Senior U.S. senators on Tuesday unveiled a bill to expand trade with Russia by removing it from a Cold War-era law that links trade with human rights, a move questioned by legislators worried about the country's support for the Syrian government. The four senators said they would push for a separate bill to address Russian human rights abuses. The bipartisan move begins what the U.S. business community hopes will be a quick sprint to win congressional approval of the legislation before Russia's entry into the World Trade Organization, which is expected by late August. "This is an opportunity to double our exports to Russia and create thousands of jobs across every sector of the U.S. economy, all at no cost to the U.S. whatsoever," Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus said in a statement. Baucus was joined on the bill to establish "permanent normal trade relations," or PNTR, with Russia by Senate Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman John Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat, and Senator John McCain, the top Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee. Senator John Thune, a Republican on the Finance Committee, also attached his name to the bill. But in a sign of trouble for what the White House has called its top trade priority this year, eight other Finance panel Republicans said Moscow's support for Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's government and a number of other concerns must be "satisfactorily" addressed before action on the trade bill.

#### PNTR top of the agenda – strong push key to passage

Palmer, 4/26

(Doug, Reuters, “UPDATE 2-US Republican urges Obama push on Russia trade bill”, Factiva)

A top Republican lawmaker pressed President Barack Obama to intensify efforts to win approval of a controversial trade bill with Russia and said separate human rights legislation might be needed to help round up votes. "It is time for the White House to get out front on this issue," Dave Camp, chairman of the House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee, said in a speech at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. With Russia set to enter the World Trade Organization by late July or August, the Obama administration has identified passage of "permanent normal trade relations" - or PNTR - with Russia as one of its top trade priorities for the year. But Camp, who announced plans to hold a hearing on the legislation in June, said the Obama administration has not engaged "strongly enough" to overcome resistance in Congress to passing the bill, which is also a top priority for U.S. business groups. With a major push from the White House, "it's possible" the bill could be passed by the August recess, Camp said. However, some trade policy analysts think the hot-button issue could be delayed until after the U.S. elections in November.

### Transportation bill was unique

#### Recent transportation bill won’t be repeated—passed through 2014, won’t be repeated until after the elections, came down to the wire

The Hill 6/29

"Congress passes highway funds, extends lower student loan rate" By Pete Kasperowicz and Daniel Strauss - 06/29/12, thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/house/235621-house-passes-highway-student-loan-flood-insurance-bill AD 6/29/12

Congress on Friday approved legislation that will extend federal highway programs through 2014, a low interest rate on student loans for one year, and the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) for five years. Leaders in the House and Senate negotiated the giant package, leaving no doubt that it would have enough support to pass. The bill will likely be the last major piece of legislation approved by Congress until after the November elections. The House voted 373-52 in favor of the bill, which was supported by every voting Democrat, while 52 Republicans opposed it. In the Senate, the tally was 74-19, with 23 Republicans joining every Democrat in voting for the measure. Sen. Olympia Snowe (R-Maine) voted present, while Sen. Daniel Inouye (D-Hawaii) missed the vote. White House spokesman Jay Carney said President Obama looks forward to signing the bill. Congress faced a weekend deadline for extending the highway and student loan provisions. The rates for federally backed student loans were set to double from 3.4 percent to 6.8 percent, and transportation funding was due to expire. The transportation bill was the most contested part of the package. Prominent conservative groups urged Republicans to vote against it, while the U.S. Chamber of Congress pushed for passage. While members were not happy with every provision in the bill, they largely praised it during floor debate in both chambers. Democrats, in particular, hailed the extension of the highway provisions for two years, which they said would boost job creation.

#### The bill was must-pass legislation and covers funding through 2014

The Hill 6/29

"Congress passes highway funds, extends lower student loan rate" By Pete Kasperowicz and Daniel Strauss - 06/29/12, thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/house/235621-house-passes-highway-student-loan-flood-insurance-bill AD 6/29/12

Rep. John Mica (R-Fla.), the chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, seemed relived to be finally approving a long-term highway bill after several short-term extensions. "It is good to be at this point in the completion of a long-overdue transportation reform bill. A lot of people said it couldn't be done," Mica said. "Tomorrow would actually close down thousands of transportation projects around the country," he added. "Transportation departments around the country were on the verge of sort of handing out IOUs or shutting down. Probably millions would have been put out of work if we hadn't acted." The highway portion of the bill authorizes spending of about $120 billion through 2014, and funds most of that by extending various fuel and highway taxes. But because those taxes don't fully cover planned spending, the bill raises new revenues from companies by making changes to the way corporate pensions are calculated, and by increasing premiums paid to the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

#### Congress needed to pass one piece of legislation before the elections to avoid the perception of gridlock

FoxBusiness 6/29

"Congress Passes Student Loans, Highway Jobs Bill," 6/29/12 Roberta Rampton and Thomas Ferraro, Reuters [www.foxbusiness.com/news/2012/06/29/us-congress-passes-bill-for-transport-jobs-student-loans/](http://www.foxbusiness.com/news/2012/06/29/us-congress-passes-bill-for-transport-jobs-student-loans/) AD 6/29/12

WASHINGTON – Congress gave final approval on Friday to a massive job-creating U.S. transportation bill that under a bipartisan deal will also keep interest rates low for millions of federal student loans and maintain federal flood insurance. The Republican-led House of Representatives and Democratic-led Senate passed the measure on back-to-back votes, clearing the way for President Barack Obama to sign it into law. In a rare display of bipartisanship, Democrats and Republicans embraced the measure largely because of $105 billion in transportation spending over the next 27 months that would create or save about 3 million jobs, a key issue in the Nov. 6 congressional and presidential elections. "The construction sector is hurting," said Democratic Senator Barbara Boxer, who led negotiations on the bill. "This was the answer." The measure would also spare a potentially key voting block, about 7.4 million students, a doubling of interest rates on their federal college loans. After months of negotiations and jockeying for political position, the House passed the bill, 373-52. The Senate approved it, 74-19. The bill came together this week as lawmakers calculated the election-year impact of continued gridlock on measures affecting jobs, soaring consumer debt, and help for people who need government underwriting for flood risk to buy a home. "It has indeed been a very bumpy road to get to this point," said John Mica, the Republican chairman of the House Transportation Committee, who led negotiations on the bill. "I'm not particularly pleased with some of the twists and turns," he said on the House floor on Friday, describing the difficulties of reaching the deal in the gridlocked Congress. After months of negotiations, the compromise was reached just days before the deadlines for an increase in student loan rates and for a lapse in transportation funding.

### Spending Link Uniqueness

#### Transportation bill that was just passed was routine

Baltimore Sun 6/10

(June 10, 2012 http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2012-06-10/news/bs-ed-transportation-20120610\_1\_transportation-bill-transportation-projects-transportation-spending)

What's frustrating is that the bill — which has been whittled down to a mere 15-month extension (and might even be trimmed to six months, according to Mr. Boehner) — should be a fairly routine matter. That has been the case in years past, when preserving and expanding U.S. transportation infrastructure, including roads, bridges, mass transit, ports and airports was seen as too important to the national interest to be derailed by partisan bickering. But that was then. The problem now is that too many extraneous issues have been tied to the measure, including various "offsets" and "pay-fors" to finance the bill instead of merely updating the federal gasoline tax to allow for inflation over the last two decades. In reality, there's a lot of accounting gimmickry involved.

#### No funding increases and the bill was only passed on a deadline

LATimes 6/29

"Congress passes transporation bill, halts student loan rate hike," Richard Simon 6/29/12 [www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-congress-passes-transportation-bill-halts-student-loan-rate-hike-20120629,0,7176382.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-congress-passes-transportation-bill-halts-student-loan-rate-hike-20120629,0,7176382.story) AD 6/29/12

The first major transportation bill since 2005, the legislation would keep highway and transit spending at current levels through the end of fiscal year 2014. It includes an expansion of a federal loan program sought by Los Angeles Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa and other mayors to fast-track bus and rail projects in traffic-choked regions. The House approved the bill by a 373-52 vote, demonstrating the power of pothole politics. The Senate approved it 74-19. The bill would provide financial incentives to states that crack down on distracted driving, require ignition interlock devices for DUI offenders and establish graduated licensing programs that restrict teenagers' driving privileges. It also would impose new safety rules on interstate passenger buses in response to a number of high-profile tour bus crashes. "Do not give up hope,’’ said Sen. Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.), chairwoman of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. She said the bill’s passage was evidence "that we can work together.’’ The bill was passed only after lawmakers once again faced deadlines — a possible shutdown of the highway program Saturday and a doubling of student interest loan rates Sunday. Lawmakers also did something unusual for this Congress: They compromised.

#### Transportation bill was funded by extending gas taxes—the plan won’t be

AP 6/29

Alan Fram and Joan Lowy "Congress passes student loans, highway jobs bill," 6/29/12 [www.kltv.com/story/18912552/congress-poised-to-act-on-highways-student-loans](http://www.kltv.com/story/18912552/congress-poised-to-act-on-highways-student-loans) AD 6/29/12

Most of the overall measure was financed by extending federal taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel for two more years. Those levies, unchanged for nearly two decades, are 18.4 cents a gallon for gasoline and 24.4 cents for diesel and now fall well short of fully financing highway programs, which they were designed to do. About $20 billion would be raised over the next decade by reducing tax deductions for companies' pension contributions and increasing the fees they pay to federally insure their pension plans. In return, a formula was changed to, in effect, let companies apportion less money for their pensions and to provide less year-to-year variation in those amounts

There is no new spending coming

Freemark, The Transport Politic, 2012

(Freemark, Yonah. “On Infrastructure, Hopes for Progress This Year Look Glum.” The Transport Politic. January 25, 2012. http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/)

The contributions of the Obama Administration to the investment in improved transportation alternatives have been significant, but it was clear from the President’s State of the Union address last night that 2012 will be a year of diminished expectations in the face of a general election and a tough Congressional opposition. Mr. Obama’s address, whatever its merits from a populist perspective, nonetheless failed to propose dramatic reforms to encourage new spending on transportation projects, in contrast to previous years. While the Administration has in some ways radically reformed the way Washington goes about selecting capital improvements, bringing a new emphasis on livability and underdeveloped modes like high-speed rail, there was little indication in the speech of an effort to expand such policy choices. All that we heard was a rather meek suggestion to transform a part of the money made available from the pullout from the Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts — a sort of war dividend whose size is undefined — to “do some nation-building right here at home.” If these suggestions fell flat for the pro-investment audience, they were reflective of the reality of working in the context of a deeply divided political system in which such once-universally supported policies as increased roads funding have become practically impossible to pursue. Mr. Obama pushed hard, we shouldn’t forget, for a huge, transformational transportation bill in early 2011, only to be rebuffed by intransigence in the GOP-led House of Representatives and only wavering support in the Democratic Senate. For the first term at least, the Administration’s transportation initiatives appear to have been pushed aside.

#### Spending was the sticking point in the compromise

Jordan 12

(Jason, APA Director of Policy and Government Affairs, “Senate Passes Transportation Bill, Next Stop Uncertain.” March 14, 2012, http://blogs.planning.org/policy/page/2/)

The White House also weighed in on the bill by calling on the House to take action. The next steps on transportation reauthorization are not yet clear. House Republicans have repeatedly failed to find majority support for a transportation bill. House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has suggested that the Senate bill might be taken up by the House. The Speaker may use passage of the Senate bill to push one more time for agreement among Republicans on a longer-term bill. While prospects in the House for a transportation bill remain murky, inaction is not an option with a March 31 deadline for the current extension of SAFETEA-LU looming. Most observers believe at least a short-term extension is likely to give time for further work on a new authorization. House leaders face a difficult situation. Some conservatives, especially among Republican freshmen, oppose the large price tag associated with the bill. Moderate, suburban district Republicans rebelled against cuts in programs popular with their constituents, like transit and enhancements. Democrats have been mostly shut out of what has historically been (and in the Senate continues to be) a bipartisan bill and are unlikely to support a House bill unless it hews close to the Senate bill. Unless positions shift, it looks difficult for the House to pass a bill with majority Republican support that wouldn’t be a heavy lift for a House-Senate conference committee. Still, with many Senate Republicans — including many conservatives — lining up behind the Senate bill, there will new pressure on the House to take action. While today’s Senate action is cause for celebration among transportation advocates, there remain significant challenges ahead.

### Rider Link

#### Extra measures get attached to transportation bills

AP 6/29

Alan Fram and Joan Lowy "Congress passes student loans, highway jobs bill," 6/29/12 [www.kltv.com/story/18912552/congress-poised-to-act-on-highways-student-loans](http://www.kltv.com/story/18912552/congress-poised-to-act-on-highways-student-loans) AD 6/29/12

As often happens with bills that are certain to win the president's signature, the measure became a catch-all for other unrelated provisions. One would order the government to accelerate work on a plan for preventing Asian carp, which devour other species, from entering the Great Lakes from the Mississippi River. It drew opposition from Sen. Dan Coats, R-Ind., and some other lawmakers arguing that blocking the fish could interfere with shipping, but the Senate turned their objections aside. Federal flood insurance programs that protect 5.6 million households and businesses were extended, allowing higher premiums and limiting subsidies for vacation homes to help address a shortfall in the program caused by claims from 2005's Hurricane Katrina. The measure also steers 80 percent out of billions in Clean Water Act penalties paid by BP and others for the 2010 Deepwater Horizon oil rig explosion to the five Gulf states whose beaches and waters were soiled by the disaster. The money would have otherwise gone to federal coffers.

### PC key

#### PC key to passage of Jackson-Vanik

The Hill ‘12

(Tensions over Syria could slow efforts to normalize Russia, U.S. trade relations. 3-18-12. http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/216549-tensions-over-syria-could-slow-legislation-to-normalize-russia-us-trade-relations.)

"In the context of considering extending PNTR, it is the time to have a plan for tackling these other issues and to make sure that we are aligned in between the Congress and the administration," Alan Larson, chairman of the board, Transparency International USA, said during the Senate Finance hearing. U.S. Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul conceded earlier this week that the Obama administration needs to ramp up its outreach to Congress to get the trade bill through by summer.

#### Obama pushing repeal, but PC will be key

WSJ ‘12

(White House Pushes for Russia Trade Agreement. 2-29-12. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203753704577254192095999600.html.)

The Obama administration on Wednesday began a public push for Congress to permanently lower trade barriers with Russia, arguing the move would benefit U.S. exporters and aid a crack down on trading violations by Moscow. U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk told lawmakers on the House Ways & Means Committee that permanently granting Russia "most favored nation" status would enable the U.S. to challenge anti-competitive practices by the country, and ensure that U.S. exporters are on level footing with foreign competitors in tapping the Russian market. "We have been very plain," Mr. Kirk said at a congressional hearing on the administration's trade priorities. "This is something collaboratively we need to achieve." But the White House likely faces a tough slog in getting the Russia measure through the House and Senate later this year, with lawmaker expressing concern over Moscow's positions on Syria and Iran and its own internal political situation.

#### Capital is key to trade agenda

Stokes 11

(Bruce, economics journalist, “An Agenda, If You Can Keep It,” 1-26, http://www2.nationaljournal.com/member/daily/balance-of-payments.)

After years of relative quiescence, Congress actually has a trade agenda in 2011: possible votes on the Korea, Colombia, and Panama trade agreements, and on Russia’s application to join the World Trade Organization. Whether, when, how, and which elements of this agenda will be completed will largely depend on political calculations in the White House and on Capitol Hill. “The first question,” observed William Reinsch, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, “is, how many of these fights does the administration want to have?” At the top of the list will be the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, which President Obama made his own by arm-wrestling the South Koreans for fixes to benefit the American auto industry. Now, that it has the support of Ford and the United Auto Workers, most observers agree that the deal with South Korea has sufficient votes for passage. And Obama has said he wants Congress to act on it by June. But the business community also wants action on the Colombia and Panama agreements negotiated by the George W. Bush administration. “From our perspective,” said Calman Cohen, president of the Emergency Committee for American Trade, “they are like three children. We want them all to go forward.” Congressional GOP leaders agree. “I strongly believe that we should consider all three agreements in the next six months,” House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp, R-Mich., said at a trade hearing this week. Objections to the Panama accord, based on tax and labor issues, seem to pose no major obstacles. Organized labor continues to highlight the murders of union organizers in Colombia and other labor-rights abuses there, but Ways and Means ranking member Sander Levin, D-Mich., a longtime critic of Colombia’s record on these issues, suggested in testimony this week that some accommodation might be possible. “I believe there is now an opportunity for the two governments to work together mutually to achieve real progress on the ground,” he said. Republican leaders in Congress have talked of voting on all three trade deals, possibly one right after the other, to facilitate the legislative calendar and, the administration suspects, to aggravate divisions among Democrats. Parliamentarians, meanwhile, will have to decide if fast-track negotiating authority still applies to the Colombia agreement. Because Congress failed to act on it when it was first submitted, the fast-track authority for the deal expired. This is not a problem in the House, where Republicans control the Rules Committee, but it is in the Senate, where fast-track is needed to facilitate a vote. Business lobbyists think that the Korea deal could move by itself before the August recess but that doing all three together will take considerably more time, contrary to Camp’s ambitions. Members of the business community are less sanguine about legislation blessing Russia’s application to join the WTO, where membership can be held up by any current member. Georgia has yet to give its assent to Russia’s application, which might make the need for U.S. action moot. To give Moscow the green light, Congress would have to accord Russia most-favored-nation trading status, thus granting it the lowest possible U.S. tariffs. That, in turn, requires waiving the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the 1974 trade act, effectively acknowledging that emigration from Russia is no longer a U.S. concern. Although Washington has no complaints about Russian emigration policy, Jackson-Vanik has long been seen as useful leverage over Moscow that many in Congress may be loath to relinquish. Capitol Hill staffers warn that passage of Russian WTO membership will be an uphill fight. Moscow has few champions in Congress, where Senate debate late last year over the New START deal demonstrated deep-seated suspicion among conservatives. Russia’s piracy of intellectual property and its past use of health and safety standards to bar the importation of U.S. poultry have also soured business interests. Buyers’ remorse over China’s admission to the WTO fuels congressional reluctance to make the same mistake twice. And Moscow’s past history of quixotic actions—cutting off gas to Ukraine, for example—makes advocates of WTO membership wary of going out on a limb only to have Moscow cut it off. Moscow is anxious to join the WTO, however, and membership is a key element in the administration’s “reset” of U.S.-Russia relations. Moreover, a Russia that is subject to international rules and dispute settlement might be better than a Russia operating outside the law. Ever since the financial crisis began in 2008, Russia has been one of the most frequent instigators of protectionist trade practices. WTO membership could help discipline such behavior. Veterans of past trade battles on Capitol Hill advise that the administration might have to give Congress something to vote for—some new oversight or restraint—to ease the pain of voting to waive Jackson-Vanik. When China was granted admission to the WTO, for example, Congress created a commission to report on Beijing’s human-rights record. After two years of relegating divisive trade issues to the back burner, in 2011 the administration now has a legislative trade agenda. The question is how much political capital it is willing to invest to get it through Congress. The White House can anticipate hand-to-hand combat in budget negotiations with Republicans over discretionary spending. Such conflict will unavoidably preoccupy administration strategists, who may want to husband their resources for more electorally attractive issues. Congress could accomplish a fair amount on trade this year, but doing so could be an uphill slog.

### A2: Uniqueness Overwhelms

#### JV is next flashpoint in Congress – no slam dunk

Roth, 3/20

(Andrew, “Jackson-Vanik Trades Places”, Russia Profile, <http://russiaprofile.org/international/56157.html>, BJM)

The clock is ticking for the Jackson-Vanik Amendment of 1974 as Russia prepares to finalize its accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) this year. The Barack Obama administration, along with U.S. Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul, has called for the law to be repealed as a relic of the Cold War. Yet conservative lawmakers are uneasy about the plan, citing concerns that lifting Jackson-Vanik will be seen as a sign of weakness by the upcoming Vladimir Putin administration. The opponents are now suggesting deals to take Jackson-Vanik off the books, but not without replacing the law with alternative legislation to censure Russia for corruption and civil rights abuses. Just two days after Vladimir Putin won a disputed 64 percent in Russia’s presidential election, U.S. President Barack Obama announced that Jackson-Vanik, a law passed in 1974 to punish the Soviet Union for its restrictive immigration policy, was on the chopping block. “I think I’ve shown that I will go anywhere in the world to open new markets for American goods. That’s why we worked so hard to secure Russia’s invitation into the WTO. That’s why I have asked Congress to repeal Jackson-Vanik, to make sure that all your companies and American companies all across the country can take advantage of it. And that's something that we're going to need some help on,” Obama told a roundtable of businessmen on March 6. The push to repeal Jackson-Vanik is quickly becoming the next flashpoint for clashes in Congress over U.S. policy toward Russia. Senate Minority Whip Jon Kyl said that supporters of lifting Jackson-Vanik in order to avoid punishing tariffs against American businesses after Russia’s WTO accession present the measure as a “slam dunk.” “But it isn’t a slam dunk,” he told a Finance Committee hearing, conveying concerns over both intellectual property protection and civil rights abuses in Russia. “When the U.S. Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul suggests that there is no association between a country’s respect for individual liberties and its business environment, he is simply denying reality.”

### A2: Thumpers

#### Its one the only things Congress will agree on before the election

Brown 3-21

(Mike-, The Hill, “Trade relations with Russia will be a boost to the U.S.”, <http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/217251-mike-brown-president-national-chicken-council>)

If there is one thing Congress can agree on during an election year, it is a policy that will spur job creation, boost economic growth and be budget neutral at the same time. Here is why authorizing permanent normal trade relations (PNTR) for Russia will accomplish all three. Members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) formally approved late last year Russia’s terms for membership in the organization during a three-day meeting of the WTO’s ministerial conference in Geneva. Russia will take its seat at the WTO 30 days after notifying the organization that the Russian Duma has ratified the membership terms. Russian Deputy Prime Minister Igor Shuvalov is on record saying that he anticipates the accession agreement being sent to the Duma in May. In Russia, retail food and beverage sales are forecast to increase in real terms from just over $200 billion in 2010 to more than $240 billion by 2014—a 20 percent increase. This is good news for U.S. food exporters as imports are expected to meet some of this growing consumer demand. But while Russia is home to 142 million consumers and maintains the world’s eleventh largest economy, it is the largest economy not yet formally subject to the global trading rules of the WTO. For U.S. companies to benefit from Russia’s accession, it will be necessary for Congress to permanently remove Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 and authorize the president to extend PNTR to Russia. Jackson-Vanik requires Russia and seven other former Soviet states and non-market economies to comply with free emigration policies before enjoying normal trade relations with the United States. Since 1994, the United States has certified annually that Russia complies with the amendment’s provisions and has conferred normal trade relations (NTR) status. Russia at times in the past has used arbitrary sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) actions that lack scientific justification to limit or even halt poultry and meat imports from the United States. Without the ability to use WTO’s dispute settlement procedures and other related mechanisms, the United States will be at a very significant disadvantage if Russia chooses to evoke bogus SPS measures against U.S. poultry. As a member of the WTO, Russia is obligated to bind its agricultural import tariffs and tariff-rate quotas (TRQs). But, if Russia misuses SPS provisions, the tariff bindings and TRQs will become a secondary concern. Other world poultry competitors will undoubtedly step up and try to replace the United States if the Russian market is disrupted for U.S. poultry exports. USTR notes that U.S. farmers and exporters will have more certain and predictable market access as a result of Russia’s commitment not to raise tariffs on any products above the negotiated rates and to apply non-tariff measures in a uniform and transparent manner. The National Chicken Council urges Congress to approve PNTR for Russia by mid-2012 to help assure the United States can continue to compete in the Russian poultry market. Exporting $300 million of poultry to Russia annually will provide better incomes for more U.S. workers and additional poultry to be produced by a growing number of family farmers across America.

### Winner’s Win Non-unique

#### Winner’s win non-unique—transportation funding

AP 6/29

Alan Fram and Joan Lowy "Congress passes student loans, highway jobs bill," 6/29/12 [www.kltv.com/story/18912552/congress-poised-to-act-on-highways-student-loans](http://www.kltv.com/story/18912552/congress-poised-to-act-on-highways-student-loans) AD 6/29/12

Congress emphatically approved legislation Friday preserving jobs on transportation projects from coast to coast and avoiding interest rate increases on new loans to millions of college students, giving lawmakers campaign-season bragging rights on what may be their biggest economic achievement before the November elections. The bill sent for President Barack Obama's signature enables just over $100 billion to be spent on highway, mass transit and other transportation programs over the next two years, projects that would have expired Saturday without congressional action. It also ends a bare-knuckle political battle over student loans that raged since spring, a proxy fight over which party was best helping voters muddle through the economic downturn.

#### Winner’s win non-unique—transportation bill

LATimes 6/29

"Congress passes transporation bill, halts student loan rate hike," Richard Simon 6/29/12 [www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-congress-passes-transportation-bill-halts-student-loan-rate-hike-20120629,0,7176382.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-congress-passes-transportation-bill-halts-student-loan-rate-hike-20120629,0,7176382.story) AD 6/29/12

WASHINGTON — Congress, in a rare display of bipartisanship, on Friday sent to President Obama a roughly $105-billion transportation bill that lawmakers from both parties touted as perhaps the largest jobs measure of the year. The measure also would avert a doubling of interest rates for millions of college student loans that was due to take effect Sunday. "The American people finally will have a jobs bill from this Congress,’’ said Eleanor Holmes Norton, a Democrat who is the Washington, D.C., delegate to the House.

## \*\*\*Obama PolCap\*\*\*

### Obama PC High

#### **Obama’s political power is currently up and will remain so—Economic conference proves.**

Walsh 6/19

(Kenneth T., staffwriter for U.S. News and World Report. “Obama Adeptly Using Political Powers of Presidency.” June 19 2012, http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/Ken-Walshs-Washington/2012/06/19/obama-adeptly-using-political-powers-of-presidency)

Political incumbents haven't been faring well in Europe, with the defeat of French President Nicolas Sarkozy the latest example. But in America the situation may be different. President Obama's deft use of the powers of his office have boosted his prospects for re-election, and his high visibility at the G-20 international economic conference this week is adding to his positive image. With his participation in the Group of 20 meetings in Mexico, Obama is showing that he knows how to be president, while Republican challenger Mitt Romney is still trying to prove that he is up to the job. On Monday, Obama urged Russian President Vladimir Putin to help the United States and its allies push Syria's ruling party out of power as a way to end the spiraling violence there. Putin didn't immediately go along, but Obama called their discussion "candid and thoughtful," and he won points for making his case directly to the Russian leader. Obama is expected to move now to an even bigger problem as he meets with other G-20 leaders to help resolve the European debt crisis. Obama's announcement Friday of a new immigration policy also enhanced his political position. Obama's announcement dominated the news just as Romney was starting a bus tour of small-town America that he hoped would show that he can connect with everyday people. The president's decision was to issue an executive order to soften deportation rules covering young people who entered the United States illegally with their parents. Obama's announcement not only appealed to Hispanics, a key element of his 2008 coalition, it also demonstrated how an incumbent can change the subject and place his opponent at a disadvantage on a moment's notice. Romney managed only a vague response, arguing that Obama's plan seemed politically motivated and was a weak response to a problem that demands a comprehensive solution. Obama's effective use of the presidency's bully pulpit to gain positive publicity has become a pattern. Earlier this spring, he marked the one-year anniversary of the death of terrorist Osama bin Laden by making a dramatic visit to Afghanistan to meet with U.S. troops. The trip gained widespread attention and underscored one of Obama's national-security successes--ordering the military raid that ended in bin Laden's death. Of course, there are drawbacks to incumbency for Obama. Most notably, he bears the brunt of criticism for the weak economy and a tepid record of job creation. But as he showed in the past week, he has some powerful tools that can make a difference.

#### Obama’s political capital gives him leverage in election

Smalera 11

(Paul, Deputy Opinions Editor at Reuters, “How Obama wins the election: the economy, stupid, and everything else.” 12/9/11, http://blogs.reuters.com/paulsmalera/2011/12/09/how-obama-wins-the-election-the-economy-stupid-and-everything-else/)

One shouldn’t feel bad for Obama — this kind of scrutiny comes with the job, after all. But the criticism his administration has endured from all sides has seemed particularly craven, perhaps because the stakes have been so very high these past few years. And yet, the political capital invested in his centrist, negotiated policies are now paying dividends. Perhaps Bill Clinton was a smoother operator, but it’s beginning to look a lot like Obama’s triangulation of policy, politics and the press is working, and that may deliver him to a political comeback and a 1996-style election victory.

#### Obama political capital high, especially with public

White 11

(Deborah, Deborah White is a journalist and writer specializing in liberal politics, and progressive issues and perspectives, “Obama to Use Post-Bin Laden Political Capital on Immigration Reform.” May 8, 2011, http://usliberals.about.com/b/2011/05/08/obama-to-use-post-bin-laden-political-capital-on-immigration-reform.htm)

Now that the President Obama's political capital is at its highest point since his 2009 inauguration, expect immigration reform to be a pressing priority of the Obama administration. Post-bin Laden and post-birth certificate silliness, President Obama is riding high in public favor. Very high, and likely never higher with conservatives, the voter group most adamantly opposed to loosening U.S. immigration laws. To win reelection in 2012, President Obama must energize and draw a hefty majority of votes from two particular demographic groups: youth, especially college students, and Latinos. Latinos, though, have been openly disappointed with President Obama's lack of accomplishments on behalf of immigration reform.

### Obama PC High – Health Care

#### Obama has more leverage—healthcare ruling allows focus to shift to more pressing issues

Thomas et al, June 28th

(Ken Thomas, Julie Pace, Steve Peoples and Jim Kuhnhenn, staff writers for Associated Press, June 28, 2012, Miami Herald, " Campaign impact: Obama, Romney seize on ruling”, http://www.miamiherald.com/2012/06/28/2872963/campaign-impact-obama-romney-seize.html)

WASHINGTON -- Battling fiercely for the White House, President Barack Obama and Republican rival Mitt Romney implored voters to see the Supreme Court's health care ruling in different ways Thursday, with Obama appealing for people to move on with him and his challenger promising to rip up the law. "Today's decision was a victory for people all over this country whose lives will be more secure," Obama declared after a divided high court upheld the law, including a requirement that people carry health insurance. "It's time for us to move forward." The outcome was a clear personal win for Obama, who has staked much of his presidency and legacy on the law. But Republicans were emboldened that it would cost him, given that the law as a whole remains unpopular and that the insurance mandate was deemed by the court to be a tax - a term never popular in an election year. For all the political furor over the decision, Romney and Obama ultimately turned their comments to the economy, where they know the election will be decided. Shortly after Romney insisted the president's law was a "job-killer," Obama called for the debate over the health care law to finally end so everyone can "focus on the most urgent challenge of our time: putting people back to work."

#### Obama has leverage—Romney would appear to be playing political game to repeal now

Yellin and Schwarz, June 28th— CNN Chief White House Correspondent and CNN White House Producer

(Jessica Yellin, CNN Chief White House Correspondent and Gabriella Schwarz, CNN White House Producer, June 28, 2012, “Obama campaign to opponents: Move past health care fight”, http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2012/06/28/obama-campaign-to-opponents-move-past-health-care-fight/)

Washington (CNN) - Team Obama attempted to frame the political debate following the Supreme Court's ruling on health care Thursday, positioning the ruling as the final word on reform and urging Republicans not to resurrect earlier political fights. "All three branches of government have now agreed that President Obama's health care law is the right thing to do," read a memo from Democratic campaign officials. "It's time to move past the same political battles and fully implement the law." The president himself made a similar case Thursday, urging the political class to pivot to the law's implementation and the economy, instead of playing politics.

#### Obama has leverage—devotion to Health care validated

Boyer, June 28th

(Dave Boyer, staff writer, June 28, 2012, The Washington Times, “Republicans: Ruling focuses election on Obama’s health care tax”, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jun/28/republicans-ruling-focuses-election-obamas-health-/)

The Supreme Court handed President Obama a major political victory on his signature health-care issue Thursday, but the justices also provided Republicans with a sharper campaign issue by defining the law’s individual mandate as a tax. The ruling allows Mr. Obama to engage in a four-month-long victory lap as he campaigns for reelection. And it validates the president’s decision to devote so much time and energy to passing the law in 2009 while the economy was in free fall, a divisive vote that contributed to Democrats losing the House in 2010. Democrats didn’t try to hide their “I-told-you-so” reaction to the decision, although Mr. Obama and some others did try to downplay the political benefits.

### Obama PC Low

#### Obama’s political capital has diminished—time and the health care bill have sapped his power.

Alter 12

(Jonathan; Former senior editor and political opinions columnist for Newsweek, staffwriter for Bloomberg View. “Barney Frank Makes a Misdiagnosis on Obamacare.” April 19, 2012, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-04-19/barney-frank-makes-a-misdiagnosis-on-obamacare.html)

Representative Barney Frank, who is not seeking re-election, gave a memorable exit interview this week to New York magazine suggesting that President Barack Obama “underestimated, as did Clinton, the sensitivity of people to what they see as an effort to make them share the health care with poor people.” The Democratic Party “paid a terrible price for health care,” [Barney] Frank said. “I would not have pushed it as hard.” take is self-serving. He argued that Obama should have proposed financial reform first, which is convenient considering that he was chairman of the House Financial Services Committee at the time and would have loved all eyes on his bill. But the question remains: Is Frank right? We know what Republicans unanimously think. What’s surprising is how many Democrats, with the benefit of hindsight and speaking sotto voce, agree with Frank. Although they support the substance of the law, they are appalled by its political fallout and wish they had a do-over. Their thinking was summarized this week in the National Journal by Michael Hirsh, who wrote that by embracing health care reform amid the economic crisis, Obama confused his priorities and took his eye off the ball, much as President George W. Bush did when he invaded Iraq instead of worrying more about al-Qaeda. This analysis has new resonance because of the recent Supreme Court oral arguments over Obamacare (a term, by the way, that the Obama campaign now embraces). Democrats are wondering if it was worth it to lose the House in 2010 and perhaps the White House in 2012 over a bill that may be declared unconstitutional, anyway. The answer is yes. To understand why, we need to be clear about the purpose of politics. It’s not to win elections -- hard as that may be to believe in the middle of a campaign. Public approval as expressed in elections is the means to change the country, not the end in itself. Insuring 30 million Americans and ending the shameful era when an illness in the family meant selling the house or declaring personal bankruptcy? Nothing to sneeze at, whatever the cost to one’s political career. Frank is mistaken that the White House underestimated the political price. At various points, Vice President Joe Biden, senior advisor David Axelrod and Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel advised the president to focus entirely on the economy and leave comprehensive health care for another day. “I begged him not to do this,” Emanuel told me when I was researching my book about Obama’s first year in office. I asked the president in late 2009 why he overruled his team. He answered: “I remember telling Nancy Pelosi that moving forward on this could end up being so costly for me politically that it would affect my chances” in 2012. But he and Pelosi agreed that if they didn’t move at the outset of the Obama presidency “it was not going to get done.” Obama was right that his political capital would diminish over time. Even if the Democrats had delayed health care and held the House in 2010, their numbers would almost certainly have been reduced. Can you imagine trying to bring it up now or in a second term? A Quicker Pivot Hirsh argues that Obama should have stayed focused on the economy not for appearances’ sake but because it was worse off than he and his closest advisers recognized. This wrongly assumes that he could have done substantively more to spur a rebound or keep the benefits of recovery from skewing toward the top 1 percent. Liberal critics rightly say that Obama should have had a broader circle that included liberal economists. But their remedy -- restructuring of the banks -- turned out to be unnecessary for reviving the economy and would have cost, by some estimates, several hundred billion dollars on top of the Troubled Asset Relief Program. It’s important to remember that Obama began his presidency with economic recovery, not health care. In his first month in office, he pushed through a mammoth stimulus package that, contrary to the analysis of Drew Westen and others, was as big as Congress would allow. There was no political appetite for a second stimulus before the first had even kicked in -- the period when health care was on the table.

#### Obama losing influence—political downfalls in June lead to lack of confidence

Milbank 6/11

(Jonathan. A regular political opinions columnist for the Washington Post. “Pileup at the White House.” June 11, 2012. http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/car-wreck-at-the-white-house/2012/06/11/gJQAl8MpVV\_story.html)

It has been a Junius Horribilis for President Obama. Job growth has stalled, the Democrats have been humiliated in Wisconsin, the attorney general is facing a contempt-of-Congress citation, talks with Pakistan have broken down, Bill Clinton is contradicting Obama, Mitt Romney is outraising him, Democrats and Republicans alike are complaining about a “cascade” of national-security leaks from his administration, and he is now on record as saying that the “private sector is doing fine.”Could it get any worse? Early Monday morning, Obama learned that it could. His aides delivered the news to him that his commerce secretary had been cited for a felony hit-and-run after allegedly crashing his car three times over the weekend. In one incident, the previously obscure Cabinet officer apparently rear-ended a Buick, spoke to the car’s occupants, then hit the vehicle again as he left. Thus did Jay Carney, the oft-besieged White House press secretary, have another briefing carjacked by bad news. And Carney, who either didn’t know the details of the bizarre episode or wasn’t at liberty to divulge them, had to execute a full range of defensive maneuvers. “I can simply tell you that he was engaged, as has been reported, in a couple of traffic incidents,” Carney began, as if the secretary, John Bryson, had been photographed by a speed camera or two. Bryson “suffered a seizure, was hospitalized. But beyond that I’ll refer you to Commerce for the details.” “Is the secretary healthy and fit to serve?” inquired Ben Feller of the Associated Press. “I would refer you to the Commerce Department.” Ann Compton of ABC News asked whether the White House chief of staff, who spoke to Bryson, considers the incident serious. “I don’t have a specific response to give you,” Carney said. CNN’s Brianna Keilar asked about “the timing of the seizure in relation to the accident.” “I would refer you, as I said in the past, to the Department of Commerce,” Carney answered. “I’ve been asking them for hours,” Keilar protested. “I think I would refer you to the Commerce Department,” was Carney’s rote reply. The former journalist informed the questioners that he “was not a presiding doctor on this case” and could confirm only that “the commerce secretary was alone, he had a seizure, he was involved in an accident.” “He was involved in several accidents,” called out April Ryan of American Urban Radio. “Thank you for the correction,” Carney said. He did not sound grateful. Carney’s non-defense doesn’t suggest much job security for Bryson, who, depending on what caused the episode Saturday, has either a medical problem or a legal problem. For the White House, it was just the latest entry in the when-it-rains-it-pours ledger. This has been one of the worst stretches of the Obama presidency. In Washington, there is a creeping sense that the bottom has fallen out and that there may be no second term. Privately, senior Obama advisers say they are no longer expecting much economic improvement before the election. Carney had the unenviable task of confronting the full arsenal of gloom at Monday afternoon’s briefing. The AP asked about the president’s unfortunate private-sector-is-fine remark. The Reuters correspondent asked about the economic “head winds” from Europe. Ed Henry of Fox News Channel asked about the looming contempt-of-Congress vote against Attorney General Eric Holder. Margaret Talev of Bloomberg News asked about the Supreme Court striking down Obamacare. Norah O’Donnell of CBS News asked about calls for a special prosecutor to probe leaks. Victoria Jones of Talk Radio News asked about the stalled talks with Pakistan. Carney sought relief by calling on TV correspondents from swing states, but the one from Wisconsin asked about the failed attempt to recall Republican Gov. Scott Walker and the one from Nevada asked about her state’s unemployment rate, the nation’s highest. Mostly, though, questions veered back to the commerce secretary’s motoring. AP Radio’s Mark Smith asked whether Bryson “is now on medical leave.”

#### Obama losing leverage with democrats, weakens negotiating abilities

Weil 6/25

(Dan, Newsmax political columnist. “Juan Williams: Conservative Democrats Weakening Obama.” June 25 2012, http://www.newsmax.com/Politics/Williams-conservativeDemocrats-weaken/2012/06/25/id/443364)

Conservative Democrats are separating themselves sharply from President Barack Obama, sapping his strength as he seeks votes from independents and negotiating leverage over Republicans, says Fox News analyst Juan Williams. West Virginia’s three top Democrats — Gov. Earl Ray Tomblin, Sen. Joe Manchin and Rep. Nick Rahall – showed their feelings about Obama last week, when they announced they will shun the Democratic National Convention, Williams writes in The Hill. Pennsylvania Rep. Mark Critz is doing the same. Over the weekend North Carolina Rep. Mike McIntyre refused to say whether he would back the president. Usually congressional candidates want a strong presidential candidate at the top of their ticket. “But in this election cycle conservative Democrats obviously see their political fortunes as separate from Obama’s,” Williams argues. The Obama campaign, of course, wants to do all it can to maintain the support of conservative Democrats, especially as the president seeks to attract the independent voters who will determine the election’s outcome. “He could use conservative Democrats as allies,” Williams writes. “The result is the White House never punishes the turncoats.” The rebels also have hurt Obama when it comes to policy. “When the history of Obama’s first term is written, conservative Democrats will also be remembered for regularly throwing wrenches into any plans coming from this president,” Williams says. Conservative Democrats made Obama change his healthcare reform plan substantially to gain their approval. They also opposed him on the Keystone oil pipeline. “And in the last week, seven conservative Senate Democrats undercut the president’s negotiations with Republicans over a budget deal,” Williams writes. “The move weakens Obama in negotiations with the GOP.”

## \*\*\*Politics Mechanics\*\*\*

### Bipart Key to Agenda

#### Bipartisanship is key to the agenda

Rottinghaus and Tedin 11 – Professors of Political Science

(Brandon Rottinghaus, Professor of Political Science, and Kent L. Tedin, Professor of Political Science, 2011, “Presidential “Going Bipartisan,” Opposition Reaction and the Consequences for Political Opinions,” The Monkey Cage, http://www.themonkeycage.org/Going%20Bipartisan%20Final.pdf)

As candidate and chief executive, Barak Obama promised the American public that his interaction with Congress would be one of accommodation and bipartisanship. Mr. Obama sought to “build a cordial relationship with Republicans by seeking guidance on policy proposals, asking for advice on appointments and hoping to avoid perceptions of political arrogance given the wide margins of his victory” (Zeleny 2008). Lamenting that “in the nation’s political debate, something is broken,” the President sought to foster an image that he and his Administration were willing to listen to and work with Republicans in Congress (Fletcher 2010). His approach is not altogether surprising. First, the American public was tired of the partisan bickering and disappointed with the (alleged) efforts at bipartisanship (Nagourney and TheeBrenan 2010). Second, “bipartisanship” is an “electoral strategy that some politicians believe will broaden their appeal, and secure the support of middle-of-the-road or swing voters” (Tubowitz and Mellow 2005, 433). Third, bipartisanship may help the president get his agenda passed into law, as some argue was the case in the 2010 lame duck Congress.

#### Bipartisanship is key to the agenda – motivates the center

Rottinghaus and Tedin 11 – Professors of Political Science

(Brandon Rottinghaus, Professor of Political Science, and Kent L. Tedin, Professor of Political Science, 2011, “Presidential “Going Bipartisan,” Opposition Reaction and the Consequences for Political Opinions,” The Monkey Cage, http://www.themonkeycage.org/Going%20Bipartisan%20Final.pdf)

The implications from our findings suggest that discussion of bipartisanship is not an empty exercise. Presidents can improve their own approval for all respondents when their message is viewed in isolation but the effect is much greater when paired with a bipartisan message from the opposition. This is especially true for Democrats who we would expect to support the President anyway, but is also notably true for Republicans. Yet, it takes two to be bipartisan. The opposition party can hurt the approval of the sitting president if they reject bipartisan advances with a partisan response. In fact, Democrats and independents that see the President making overtures and being rejected in a bitterly partisan way are more likely to disapprove of the President. The response from the opposition matters as well. As the partisan messages from the House Minority Leader grow more partisan, Democrats’ ratings of the Republican Party go from very small to negative, not a surprise since these groups were predisposed to not favor the opposition party. On the other hand, as the response from Representative Boehner grew more partisan, Republicans grew more likely to favor the Republican Party. Although independents are not especially persuaded by bipartisan messages from either or both parties, they are certainly angered by partisan messages from the opposition party as the evidence suggests that the aggressive partisan message from John Boehner significantly reduced support for the Republican Party.

### AT: Bipart Key to Agenda

#### Bipartisanship fails—not key to the agenda and weakens bills.

Sargent ‘10

(Greg, the editor of Election Central, Talking Points Memo's politics and elections. “Liberals were right about futility of bipartisanship”. May 17, 2010. http://voices.washingtonpost.com/plum-line/2010/05/the\_liberals\_were\_right\_about.html)

Liberals were right about futility of bipartisanship There's another fascinating revelation buried in The Promise, Jonathan Alter's new book on Obama's first year: Specifically, it turns out key players on health care had decided early on that the quest for GOP support was futile -- yet they continued pursuing it anyway. Many on the left, of course, were loudly claiming at the time that Dems were falling into the GOP's trap by continuing to chase bipartisan support for its own sake. But those making this argument were dismissed as unserious and unschooled in the real workings of Washington. Turns out, though, that this was a view shared inside the White House. Alter writes that top Obama aides concluded early that the pursuit for Chuck Grassley's support in particular was not going to pay off. Senior Obama adviser Jim Messina, for instance, pleaded with Senator Max Baucus, who at the time was trying to cut an awesomely bipartisan deal with Senate Republicans, to forget about Grassley. Rahm Emanuel agreed with Messina that Grassley was a non-starter. "They thought the president was wasting his time by having Grassley over to the White House half a dozen times," Alter writes. Harry Reid, too, had concluded early on that bipartisan support for health reform would never materialize -- but he let Baucus continue pursuing it, anway. "Harry Reid knew from long experience with the opposition that there would be no `Kumbaya moment' when the Republicans would concede error and convert to support for comprehensive health care reform," Alter writes. "But Reid was old-school and deferred to Baucus." As one White House aide condeded to Alter: "I wish we'd put our foot down harder and said, 'It's over, Max.'" These players, of course, have their own reasons for leaking this account now. But it seems feasible. After all, a five year old could see at the time that Senate Republicans were playing for time, in order to drag the process on for as long as possible and sour the public on it. Depressing.

#### Link outweighs link turn – Bipartisanship isn’t key if Obama has political capital

Tomma 9’

(Steven Tomma, staff writer, 1-30-2009, “Obama finds partisanship still alive and well n Washington,” Miami Herald, http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2009/01/30/61191/obama-finds-partisanship-still.html)

Well, score a big one for civility. President Obama has met repeatedly with Republicans, inviting several for cocktails at the White House this week even after they voted against his proposed $819 billion plan to boost the economy. He's asked more over on Sunday to watch the Super Bowl. He's batting zero so far in the quest for bipartisanship, however. After watching congressional Democrats move the stimulus proposal more toward spending and away from the tax cuts that Republican prefer, he failed to muster a single Republican vote for the package in the House of Representatives. Does it matter? Not when it comes to passing legislation. Like Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933, Obama has enough popularity, a nationwide hunger for action to address a crisis and big enough majorities in Congress to get pretty much what he wants with nominal bargaining in the Senate to reach the necessary 60 votes.

### Concessions Key to Agenda

#### Concessions key to the agenda—Republicans will jump on board

Lichtman ‘10 – Prof of American Political History @ American University.

(Allan, Professor of American Political History, American University. “Analysis of Obama's First State of the Union Address”. January 28, 2010. http://fpc.state.gov/136240.htm)

You said that the Republican party has its own strategy to continue to oppose President Obama’s political agenda. In that circumstances, **is it a good thing for President Obama to make some concessions**? I mean that if he continues to make some concessions and the Republican party will continue to oppose and try to defeat him, I think it only contributed to the losing support from the labor party. So he has no political ground to depend on. Dr. Lichtman: That’s always the dilemma, obviously, for any leader. To what extent do you shore up your base and to what extent do you reach out to the opposition and to those in the middle? I think **we saw** last night a bit of **a strategy of making concessions and reaching out. His proposals on the economy. Some of which were fairly far-reaching, and obviously things Republicans will not support like moving to alternative energy, investment in high speed trains, and things of that nature. But there was a lot in there that Republicans, if they wanted to, could support. Tax credits for small businesses, putting some of the Wall Street money into community banks, capital gains tax reductions.** Those are things you’ve heard Republicans in fat talk about. **So by doing that** I think **he’s essentially trying to achieve two things. One, maybe on some of these things Republicans will come around and they’ll actually have some accomplishments to go to the electorate with in 2010,** and there is a bit of a pressure there. On the one hand, implacable opposition may serve the Republican party in general, but there are individual Republican Members of the House and Senate who have to go before the electorate in November, and maybe they want some accomplishments. So that’s one thing he might be angling for. **The other thing is if the Republicans oppose such moderate proposals which seem to have at least according to the snap polls overwhelming support from the American people he’d be in a better position to paint the Republicans as the party of obstruction and delay.**

#### Obama’s concessions key to the agenda.

Schorr ‘9

(Daniel Schorr, Senior News Analyst, National Public Radio, Obama's First 100 Days, April 22, 2009. http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=103377163)

The **Obama** record so far presents a mixed picture. There has not been much progress on his goal of changing the way Washington works, neutralizing the lobbyists, or assembling a reliable bipartisan coalition. But **by adroit concessions when necessary, he has managed to achieve important legislation,** notably the multi-billion dollar stimulus package. **Faced with possible defeat, he managed to make concessions that chipped away three Republican senators.**

### AT: Concessions Key to Agenda

#### Concessions won’t work—Republicans will pocket them

Alternet News Magazine ‘10

(“Why America is Starting to Burn: Political Gridlock and Violent Insurrection”. March 11, 2010. http://blogs.alternet.org/theghost/2010/03/11/why-america-is-starting-to-burn-political-gridlock-and-violent-insurrection/)

The American people as a whole have far less esoteric political concerns than the environmental destruction of Appalachia, but they seem to share my feelings of despair and hopelessness over the issues that matter most to them**. On every topic of relevance** to the average, everyday American citizen – especially health care reform and the economy – **there has been almost no movement from our perpetually deadlocked government. It has become such a regular ritual that the script for it is a cliche-ridden as any big budget summer blockbuster**. Whatever the issue of the moment is, **the Republicans in Congress will shriek and moan about deficits and socialism.** President **Obama will try to act statesmanlike and above the fray, while Democrats in Congress will try to appease their colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Then, once the concessions are made, the Republicans will stop cooperating and the Democrats will be left scratching their heads as to why their friends refuse to play nice with them**. To official Washington this is all game. It has lengthy written rules but comes with an unofficial strategy guide that tells players how to get the most points – er, votes and campaign contributions – by using lobbyists and the media to maximum effect. And through the ability of lawmakers to become lobbyists themselves, or to sign up with corporate America afterwords, it’s rarely “game over” even when they lose. The rest of us, those who need health insurance or who were dependent upon the continued unemployment benefits that Senator Jim Bunning (R-KY) decided he wanted to block, have no guarantee of a second chance.

#### Won’t work- Republicans will pocket them.

Borosage ‘9

(Robert Borosage, The Price of Consensus: Obama and Congressional Republicans, January 7, 2009, <http://www.ourfuture.org/blog-entry/2009010207/price-consensus-obama-and-congressional-republicans>)

**Politically, Obama's generosity is unlikely to be rewarded.** The **congressional Republican** caucus is more conservative and clueless than ever. They **will see Obama's preemptive concessions as weakness, not generosity. They are already pocketing them and asking for more**. Boehner is grousing about "the size of the package." Mitch McConnell responded by calling for more tax cuts and peddling the lunatic notion that rather than providing grants to states and localities to avoid massive layoffs—perhaps the most effective dollar-for-dollar spending that we can do in terms of saving jobs—the federal government should loan them the money instead. Republicans don't want unemployment insurance to go to part-time workers, and oppose paying for health care for those who have been laid off. They are pushing for permanent reductions in capital gains and income tax rates for—imagine our surprise—business and the highest-income earners. These are the very ideas that helped get us into this hole.

.

### Focus Internals

#### Insufficient presidential focus tanks the agenda

Beckman 10 – Professor of Political Science

(Matthew N. Beckman, Professor of Political Science @ UC-Irvine, 2010, “Pushing the Agenda: Presidential Leadership in U.S. Lawmaking, 1953-2004,” pg. 152)

Americans never see a shortage of national problems needing solutions. Reviewing Gallup's time-honored question about the "most important problem facing the country today" reveals that postwar Americans, in addition to frequently viewing the economy as problematic, have at various points also cited civil rights, energy, health care, crime, and welfare as being among their most pressing concerns. And, however much the omnibus categories paper over the particulars (e.g., inflation versus unemployment versus taxes), they nonetheless capture the essential point: salient, substantial problems always await American presidents. Before spelling out which problems are ripest for presidential pick- ing, I should first note that presidents must pick; they must prioritize. On this score, President Jimmy Carter's experience is instructive. Asked by a reporter if he would "be able to keep fully all [his] campaign promises," President Carter expressed his intention sincerely: "My determination is to keep all those promises" (23 February 1977). As became readily apparent, by insufficiently prioritizing certain initiatives, the Carter administration was unable to target resources effectively, from start to finish, earlygame to endgame. This basic error helps explain why so much of President Carter's legislative agenda languished on Capitol Hill.

#### New issues tradeoff with congressional agenda

Feehery ‘9

(John, president of Feehery Group, a Washington-based advocacy firm that has represented clients including the News Corp., Ford Motor Co. and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Commentary: Obama enters 'The Matrix', http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/07/21/feehery.obama.matrix/)

**The legislative calendar is simply not that long.** A new administration has a little less than a year to pass its big-ticket items, mostly because it is very hard to get major initiatives done in an election year. Take away the three months it takes to hire key staff, a couple of months for the various congressional recesses, and **you have about six months to really legislate. Since Congress is supposed to use some time to pass its annual spending bills** (there are 12 that need to be passed each year, not counting supplemental spending bills), **time for big initiatives is actually very limited. Each day the president takes time** to travel overseas or to throw out the first pitch at an All Star game, **he is taking time away from making contacts with legislators whose support is crucial for the president's agenda. Time is not a limitless resource on Capitol Hill.**

### AT: Focus

#### Agenda focus constantly shifts- plan won’t disrupt top priorities

Light ‘99

(Paul Light, Director of Governmental Studies at Brookings Institute, The President’s Agenda)

**The President’s agenda** is a remarkable list. It **is rarely written down. It constantly shifts and evolves. It is often in flux even for the President** and the top staff. **Items move onto the agenda one day and off the next**. Because of its status in the policy process, the President’s agenda is the subject of intense conflict. The infighting is resolved sometimes through mutual consent and “collegial” bargaining, sometimes through marked struggle and domination. **It is not surprising that we know so little about it.**

#### Delayed focus key to effective use of capital

Newstex ‘9

(June 23, 2009, LN)

For now, the White House should have as little to do as possible with the various legislative products. **Let the committees absorb the blows of the bad weeks**. Let the early coalitions present themselves. Let the Republicans show their strategy in the mark-up sessions. Let the CBO score all the different options. Let the legislature familiarize itself with different revenue options. Wait**. Wait and wait and wait. Wait until Congress has pushed this as far upfield as it's able. Then open up the White House.** Then have Obama on TV. Then have Rahm on the phone with legislators. Then take Olympia Snowe for a ride on Marine One. **The White House can exert explosive force on a piece of legislation, but it can only do so effectively for a short period of time. That was the mistake Clinton** White House **made** in 1994. **By the time their legislation was near reality, administration officials were so deeply involved that they couldn't add external momentum.** It is not a mistake that Rahm Emmanuel, who watched it all happen firsthand, means to repeat.

#### Focus links not true for Obama

Herald Times ‘9

(April 29, 2009, LN)

**I don't think any of us were quite prepared for the sheer energy this new president demonstrated in his first 100 days.** The number of press conferences, policy speeches, cross-country and international travels on top of new initiatives to bolster financial markets has been mind-boggling. Obama said he would close down Guantanamo Bay, and the process is under way. He said he would extend health care to children, and he has signed into law a program that will provide more than 11 million children with health care. He said he would assess the situation in Iraq and provide a plan to bring our troops home safely. He said he would reverse many of George W. Bush's executive orders on stem-cell research and did that, too**. One astute political observer recently told me that Obama reminds her of an octopus with eight arms, all doing different things, but each done with agile efficiency.**

### Political Capital Key to Agenda

#### Political capital key to the agenda

Hill ‘10

(Dell, http://www.uncoverage.net/2010/05/obama-political-capital-tank-running-on-empty/, “Obama’s Political Capital Tank Running On Empty”,May 2)

Basically, **political capital is the currency of politics.** It’s what one politician uses to convince another politician to support a particular piece of legislation.  **Some would call it “one hand washing the other” and that’s a fair analogy.   For the President to advance a political agenda, political capital is his fuel tank to get things done.  He wheels and deals – all the while using that political fuel tank to get what he ultimately wants, and some agendas consume incredible amounts of that fuel.  ObamaCare**, for instance, **required an enormous amount of political capital to get enacted**.  It has become the centerpiece of the Obama administration and is, quite frankly, about the only real victory the President can claim, but **it came at a tremendous** cost, literally and **figuratively**.

#### Political capital is key and finite – Congressional backlash risks the entire agenda

Feehery ‘9

(John, president of Feehery Group, a Washington-based advocacy firm that has represented clients including the News Corp., Ford Motor Co. and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Commentary: Obama enters 'The Matrix', http://www.cnn.com/2009/POLITICS/07/21/feehery.obama.matrix/)

Probably the most intangible and most unpredictable part of the legislative process is the rather large egos of the legislators. Despite having generally milquetoast reputations, **each member of Congress has a variety of factors that impact how and why they vote**. Of course, **their chief motivation is political survival**. But each assesses their political viability differently, and loyalty to **the White House is not always top of the list**. Some members of Congress, who have been in the trenches for decades, have healthy egos that need love and affection from the Obama administration. For example, when the White House concluded deals with health care providers, legislative leaders like Charlie Rangel and Henry Waxman, who weren't party to the talks, threw a fit, said the deals didn't apply to them, and sent a strong message that they weren't going to honor those commitments. That of course, threw the larger health care negotiations into disarray. **Egos matter on Capitol Hill, and stroking them is an essential part of cracking the congressional code.** In the movie "The Matrix," Keanu Reeves, playing Neo, ends the film with the line, "Anything is possible." In a Hollywood movie, anything is possible. But **in Congress, with limited money, limited time and limited patience, the president can't get everything he wants**. And after watching his cap and trade proposal fall flat in the Senate, his health care bill lose support in both chambers, his tax proposals meet stiff resistance from the business community and key centrist Democrats, and his financial service reform proposals go nowhere, he risks getting nothing that he wants.

### Political Capital True

#### Political capital theory is true – newest data proves that presidents have significant legislative influence

Beckman 10 – Professor of Political Science

(Matthew N. Beckman, Professor of Political Science @ UC-Irvine, 2010, “Pushing the Agenda: Presidential Leadership in U.S. Lawmaking, 1953-2004,” pg. 2-3)

Developing presidential coalition building as a generalizable class of strategies is itself instructive, a way of bringing clarity to presidential– congressional dynamics that have previously appeared idiosyncratic, if not irrational. However, the study’s biggest payoff comes not from identifying presidents’ legislative strategies but rather from discerning their substantive effects. In realizing how presidents target congressional processes upstream (how bills get to the ﬂoor, if they do) to inﬂuence downstream policy outcomes (what passes or does not), we see that standard tests of presidential inﬂuence have missed most of it. Using original data and new analyses that account for the interrelationship between prevoting and voting stages of the legislative process, I ﬁnd that presidents’ legislative inﬂuence is real, often substantial, and, to date, greatly underestimated.

#### Political capital theory is true – modern presidents have unique capabilities – it’s finite

Beckmann and Kumar 11

(Matt, Professor of Political Science, and Vimal, How presidents push, when presidents win: A model of positive presidential power in US lawmaking, Journal of Theoretical Politics 2011 23: 3)

Fortunately for contemporary presidents, today’s White House affords its occupants an unrivaled supply of persuasive carrots and sticks. Beyond the ofﬁce’s unique visibility and prestige, among both citizens and their representatives in Congress, presidents may also sway lawmakers by using their discretion in budgeting and/or rulemaking, unique fundraising and campaigning capacity, control over executive and judicial nominations, veto power, or numerous other options under the chief executive’s control. Plainly, when it comes to the arm-twisting, brow-beating, and horse-trading that so often characterizes legislative battles, modern presidents are uniquely well equipped for the ﬁght In the following we employ the omnibus concept of ‘presidential political capital’ to capture this conception of presidents’ positive power as persuasive bargaining. 1 Speciﬁ cally, we deﬁne presidents’ political capital as the class of tactics White House ofﬁcials employ to induce changes in lawmakers’ behavior. 2 Importantly, this conception of presidents’ positive power as persuasive bargaining not only meshes with previous scholarship on lobbying (see, e.g., Austen-Smith and Wright (1994), Groseclose and Snyder (1996), Krehbiel (1998: ch. 7), and Snyder (1991)), but also presidential practice. 3 For example, Goodwin recounts how President Lyndon Johnson routinely allocated ‘rewards’ to ‘cooperative’ members: The rewards themselves (and the withholding of rewards) . . . might be something as unobtrusive as receiving an invitation to join the President in a walk around the White House grounds, knowing that pictures of the event would be sent to hometown newspapers . . . [or something as pointed as] public works projects, military bases, educational research grants, poverty projects, appointments of local men to national commissions, the granting of pardons, and more. (Goodwin, 1991: 237) Of course, presidential political capital is a scarce commodity with a ﬂoating value. Even a favorably situated president enjoys only a ﬁnite supply of political capital; he can only promise or pressure so much. What is more, this capital ebbs and ﬂows as realities and/or perceptions change. So, similarly to Edwards (1989), we believe presidents’ bargaining resources cannot fundamentally alter legislators’ predispositions, but rather operate ‘at the margins’ of US lawmaking, however important those margins may be (see also Bond and Fleisher (1990), Peterson (1990), Kingdon (1989), Jones (1994), and Rudalevige (2002)). Indeed, our aim is to explicate those margins and show how presidents may systematically inﬂuence them.

#### Even if pundits exaggerate the president’s influence, it still is salient

Beckman 10 – Professor of Political Science

(Matthew N. Beckman, Professor of Political Science @ UC-Irvine, 2010, “Pushing the Agenda: Presidential Leadership in U.S. Lawmaking, 1953-2004,” pg. 17)

Even though Washington correspondents surely overestimate a sitting president's potential sway in Congress, more than a kernel of truth remains. Modern presidents do enjoy tremendous persuasive assets: unmatched public visibility; unequaled professional staff, unrivaled historical prestige, unparalleled fundraising capacity. And buttressing these persuasive power sources are others, including a president’s considerable discretion over federal appointments, bureaucratic rules, legislative vetoes, and presidential trinkets.9 So even with their limitations duly noted, presidents clearly still enjoy an impressive bounty in the grist of political persuasion - one they can (and do) draw on to help build winning coalitions on Capitol Hill.

#### Presidents can agenda set and marshal public support.

Drum 3/12

(Kevin Drum is a political blogger for Mother Jones. “Presidents and the Bully Pulpit’. March 12, 2012. Mother Jones. http://motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2012/03/presidents-and-bully-pulpit)

I also think that Ezra doesn't really grapple with the strongest arguments on the other side. For one thing, although there are examples of presidential offensives that failed (George Bush on Social Security privatization), there are also example of presidential offensives that succeeded (George Bush on going to war with Iraq). The same is true for broader themes. For example, Edwards found that "surveys of public opinion have found that support for regulatory programs and spending on health care, welfare, urban problems, education, environmental protection and aid to minorities increased rather than decreased during Reagan’s tenure." OK. But what about the notion that tax cuts are good for the economy? The public may have already been primed to believe this by the tax revolts of the late '70s, but I'll bet Reagan did a lot to cement public opinion on the subject. And the Republican tax jihad has been one of the most influential political movements of the past three decades. More generally, I think it's a mistake to focus narrowly on presidential speeches about specific pieces of legislation. Maybe those really don't do any good. But presidents do have the ability to rally their own troops, and that matters. That's largely what Obama has done in the contraception debate. Presidents also have the ability to set agendas. Nobody was talking about invading Iraq until George Bush revved up his marketing campaign in 2002, and after that it suddenly seemed like the most natural thing in the world to a lot of people. Beyond that, it's too cramped to think of the bully pulpit as just the president, just giving a few speeches. It's more than that. It's a president mobilizing his party and his supporters and doing it over the course of years. That's harder to measure, and I can't prove that presidents have as much influence there as I think they do. But I confess that I think they do. Truman made containment national policy for 40 years, JFK made the moon program a bipartisan national aspiration, Nixon made working-class resentment the driving spirit of the Republican Party, Reagan channeled the rising tide of the Christian right and turned that resentment into the modern-day culture wars, and George Bush forged a bipartisan consensus that the threat of terrorism justifies nearly any defense. It's true that in all of these cases presidents were working with public opinion, not against it, but I think it's also true that different presidents might have shaped different consensuses.

### Political Capital Finite

#### Political capital is finite – drains ability to pass other legislation

Seidenfeld ‘94

(Mark, Associate Professor at Florida State University College of Law, Iowa Law Review, October, Lexis.)

The cumbersome process of enacting legislation interferes with the President's ability to get his legislative agenda through Congress much as it hinders direct congressional control of agency policy-setting. [196](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=3bed01436420a4c408c7084fd3a9ddee&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAA&_md5=41b32a15be79432978f3fe1965398262#n196) **A President has a limited amount of political capital he can use to press for a legislative agenda, and precious little time to get his agenda enacted.** [197](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=3bed01436420a4c408c7084fd3a9ddee&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAA&_md5=41b32a15be79432978f3fe1965398262#n197) These constraints prevent the President from marshalling through Congress all but a handful of statutory provisions reflecting his policy  [\*39]  vision. Although such provisions, if carefully crafted, can significantly alter the perspectives with which agencies and courts view regulation, such judicial and administrative reaction is not likely to occur quickly. Even after such reaction occurs, a substantial legacy of existing regulatory policy will still be intact. In addition, the propensity of congressional committees to engage in special-interest-oriented oversight might seriously undercut presidential efforts to implement regulatory reform through legislation. [198](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=3bed01436420a4c408c7084fd3a9ddee&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAA&_md5=41b32a15be79432978f3fe1965398262#n198) On any proposed regulatory measure, the President could face opposition from powerful committee members whose ability to modify and kill legislation is well-documented. [199](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=3bed01436420a4c408c7084fd3a9ddee&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAA&_md5=41b32a15be79432978f3fe1965398262#n199) This is not meant to deny that the President has significant power that he can use to bring aspects of his legislative agenda to fruition**. The President's ability to focus media attention** on an issue, his power to bestow **benefits on** the constituents of **members of Congress who support his agenda, and his potential to deliver votes in congressional elections increase the likelihood of legislative success for particular programs**. [200](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=3bed01436420a4c408c7084fd3a9ddee&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAA&_md5=41b32a15be79432978f3fe1965398262#n200) **Repeated use of such tactics, however, will** impose economic costs on society and concomitantly **consume the President's political capital**. [201](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=3bed01436420a4c408c7084fd3a9ddee&csvc=bl&cform=searchForm&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLzVtb-zSkAA&_md5=41b32a15be79432978f3fe1965398262#n201) At some point the price to the President for pushing legislation through Congress exceeds the benefit he derives from doing so. Thus, a President would be unwise to rely too heavily on legislative changes to implement his policy vision.

### Political Capital Not Key

#### Political capital not key to the agenda

-their evidence misuses the term

-ideological and partisan leanings outweigh

Dickinson 9 – Professor of Political Science

(Matthew, professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt, 5-26-2009, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” <http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/>)

As for Sotomayor, from here the path toward almost certain confirmation goes as follows: the Senate Judiciary Committee is slated to hold hearings sometime this summer (this involves both written depositions and of course open hearings), which should lead to formal Senate approval before Congress adjourns 1for its summer recess in early August.  So Sotomayor will likely take her seat in time for the start of the new Court session on October 5.  (I talk briefly about the likely politics of the nomination process below). What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power.  Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress.  That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences?  How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes?  These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power.  This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does.  Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence.  Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants.  (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying.  But this is not to say that presidents lack influence.  Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose.  That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting.   And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination.  Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox.

#### Political capital isn’t key

Beckmann and Kumar 11

(Matt, Professor of Political Science, and Vimal, How presidents push, when presidents win: A model of positive presidential power in US lawmaking, Journal of Theoretical Politics 2011 23: 3)

For political scientists, however, the resources allocated to formulating and implementing the White House’s lobbying offensive appear puzzling, if not altogether misguided. Far from highlighting each president’s capacity to marshal legislative proposals through Congress, the prevailing wisdom now stresses contextual factors as predetermining his agenda’s fate on Capitol Hill. From the particular ‘political time’ in which they happen to take ofﬁce (Skowronek, 1993) to the state of the budget (Brady and Volden, 1998; Peterson, 1990), the partisan composition of Congress (Bond and Fleisher, 1990; Edwards, 1989) (see also Gilmour (1995), Groseclose and McCarty (2001), and Sinclair (2006)) to the preferences of speciﬁc ‘pivotal’ voters (Brady and Volden, 1998; Krehbie, l998), current research suggests a president’s congressional fortunes are basically beyond his control. The implication is straightforward, as Bond and Fleisher indicate: …presidential success is determined in large measure by the results of the last election. If the last election brings individuals to Congress whose local interests and preferences coincide with the president’s, then he will enjoy greater success. If, on the other hand, most members of Congress have preferences different from the president’s, then he will suffer more defeats, and no amount of bargaining and persuasion can do much to improve his success. (Bond and Fleisher, 1990: 13

#### Voter preferences outweigh

Beckman 10 – Professor of Political Science

(Matthew N. Beckman, Professor of Political Science @ UC-Irvine, 2010, “Pushing the Agenda: Presidential Leadership in U.S. Lawmaking, 1953-2004,” pg. 63)

The second nonpresidential factor that shapes presidents' policy- making prospects is lawmakers' preferences, especially those of opposing leaders and pivotal voters. When it comes to the president's agenda, the more these strategically positioned lawmakers agree with him (or at least the less they differ), the better his chances for secur- ing a favorable deal in the legislative earlygame and/or winning a key vote in the legislative endgame. By contrast, when leading opponents and swing voters resolutely oppose the president's plan, nothing the president or his aides can do will push his initiatives to passage. And, to be sure, presidents have very little say over Congress' composition, its leaders, or their predispositions.

#### Presidential involvement makes legislation more likely to fail

Klein ‘12

(Ezra Klein. “The Unpersuaded: Who Listen’s to the President”. March 19, 2012. The New Yorker. - Frances Lee, professor of American Politics @ the University of Maryland - Study of 8,600 Senate votes from between 1981 and 2004. http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2012/03/19/120319fa\_fact\_klein?currentPage=all)

In January, 2004, George W. Bush announced his intention to “take the next steps of space exploration: human missions to Mars and to worlds beyond.” It was an occasion that might have presented a moment of bipartisan unity: a Republican President was proposing to spend billions of dollars on a public project to further John F. Kennedy’s dream of venturing deep into the cosmos. As Frances Lee, now a professor at the University of Maryland, recalls, “That wasn’t a partisan issue at all. Democrats had no position on sending a mission to Mars.” But, she says, “they suddenly began to develop one. They began to believe it was a waste of money.” Congressional Democrats pushed the argument in press releases, public statements, and television appearances. In response, the White House, which had hinted that the Mars mission would feature prominently in the State of the Union address, dropped it from the speech. The experience helped to crystallize something that Lee had been thinking about. “Most of the work on the relationship between the President and Congress was about the President as the agenda setter,” she says. “I was coming at it from the perspective of the increase in partisanship, and so I looked at Presidents not as legislative leaders but as party leaders.” That changes things dramatically. As Lee writes in her book “Beyond Ideology” (2009), there are “inherent zero-sum conflicts between the two parties’ political interests as they seek to win elections.” Put more simply, the President’s party can’t win unless the other party loses. And both parties know it. This, Lee decided, is the true nature of our political system. To test her theory, she created a database of eighty-six hundred Senate votes between 1981 and 2004. She found that a President’s powers of persuasion were strong, but only within his own party. Nearly four thousand of the votes were of the mission-to-Mars variety—they should have found support among both Democrats and Republicans. Absent a President’s involvement, these votes fell along party lines just a third of the time, but when a President took a stand that number rose to more than half. The same thing happened with votes on more partisan issues, such as bills that raised taxes; they typically split along party lines, but when a President intervened the divide was even sharper. One way of interpreting this is that party members let their opinion of the President influence their evaluation of the issues. That’s not entirely unreasonable. A Democrat might have supported an intervention in Iraq but questioned George W. Bush’s ability to manage it effectively. Another interpretation is that party members let their political incentives influence how they evaluate policy. “Whatever people think about raw policy issues, they’re aware that Presidential successes will help the President’s party and hurt the opposing party,” Lee says. “It’s not to say they’re entirely cynical, but the fact that success is useful to the President’s party is going to have an effect on how members respond.” Or, to paraphrase Upton Sinclair, it’s difficult to get a man to support something if his reëlection depends on his not supporting it. Both parties are guilty of this practice. Karl Rove, President Bush’s deputy chief of staff, recalls discussing the Social Security privatization plan with a sympathetic Democrat on the House Ways and Means Committee. He says that the representative told him, “You wouldn’t get everything you want and I wouldn’t get everything I want, but we could solve the problem. But I can’t do it because my leadership won’t let me.” Rove says, “It was less about Social Security than it was about George W. Bush.” At various times during the nineteen-nineties, Clinton and other Democrats had been open to adding some form of private accounts to Social Security, and in 1997 there were, reportedly, quiet discussions between Democrats and Republicans about doing exactly that. In theory, this background might have led to a compromise in 2005, but Bush’s aggressive sales pitch had polarized the issue. The Obama Administration was taken by surprise when congressional Republicans turned against the individual mandate in health-care reform; it was the Republicans, after all, who had championed the idea, in 1993, as an alternative to the Clinton initiative. During the next decade, dozens of Senate Republicans co-sponsored health-care plans that included a mandate. Mitt Romney, of course, passed one when he was governor of Massachusetts. In 2007, when Senator Jim DeMint, of South Carolina—now a favorite of the Tea Party—endorsed Romney for President, he cited his health-care plan as a reason for doing so. Senator Orrin Hatch, of Utah, who supported the mandate before he opposed it, shrugs off his party’s change of heart. “We were fighting Hillarycare,” he has said, of the Republicans’ original position. In other words, Clinton polarized Republicans against one health-care proposal, and then Obama turned them against another. Representative Jim Cooper, a Democrat from Tennessee, takes Lee’s thesis even further. “The more high-profile the communication effort, the less likely it is to succeed,” he says. “In education reform, I think Obama has done brilliantly, largely because it’s out of the press. But on higher-profile things, like deficit reduction, he’s had a much tougher time.” Edwards’s work suggests that Presidential persuasion isn’t effective with the public. Lee’s work suggests that Presidential persuasion might actually have an anti-persuasive effect on the opposing party in Congress. And, because our system of government usually requires at least some members of the opposition to work with the President if anything is to get done, that suggests that the President’s attempts at persuasion might have the perverse effect of making it harder for him to govern.

### Public Popularity Key to Political Capital

#### Public popularity is key to political capital

Weissert and Weissert ‘6 – Professors of Political Science @ Florida State

(Carol and William, Professors in the Department of Political Science at Florida State University, Governing Health: The Politics of Health Policy, p.99, Available via Google books)

Political capital is the strength of a president’s popularity and of his party in Congress, and his electoral margin. Political capital is important because it affects Congress’s receptivity to the president’s proposals. **Presidential popularity,** reflected in public approval polls**, is a crucial component of political capital, given that presidents who can arouse and mobilize the public are apt to “greatly lessen” their problems in Congress** (Sullivan 1987, 300). Rivers and Rose (1985) estimated that **a 1 percent increase in the president’s popularity leads to a 1 percent increase in his legislative approval rate.** Even legislative sponsors can be persuaded by public opinion influenced by the president (MacKuen and Mouw 1992). Similarly, potential opponents may think twice about voting against a measure supported by a particularly popular president. **The president’s popularity is especially important when he is of the party of the congressional majority.** The components that make up the political capital of presidents since Lyndon Johnson are shown in table 2.1.

#### Popularity is critical to political capital – Bush and Johnson presidencies prove

McLaughlin and McLaughlin ‘7 – Professor Emeritus at the Business School and School of Public Health @ UNC

(Curtis P., Professor Emeritus at the Kenan-Flager Business School and School of Public Health at the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, and Craig D., Executive Director of the Washington State Board of Health, Health Policy Analysis, pg. 244, Google books)

A president’s ability to push a measure through Congress depends in large part on his or her political capital. For presidents, **political capital primarily comes down to two things—their popularity and their party’s strength in Congress**. For a recently elected president, popularity can be judged by the electoral margin of victory. For a president well into her or his term, popularity can be assessed by opinion polls. George W. **Bush, for example, took office after losing the popular vote. He had no claim to a mandate, and his approval rating was an unremarkable 57 percent** in February 2001, according to a Gallup poll. Even though his party was only one vote shy of a majority in the Senate and held a clear majority in the House, he enjoyed little success with Congress in the early days. **His political capital increased after** the attacks of **September 11**, 2001, **because his approval rating as a wartime president hit an astounding 90%.** Public approval tanked as dissatisfaction with the war in Iraq grew. **After the 2006 election, he was a lame duck facing Democratic majorities in Congress—his political capital was negligible. The 1965 passage of Medicaid and Medicare has been attributed to** Lyndon **Johnson’s phenomenal political capital. He clearly had a mandate, as he was elected with more than 61% of the popular vote**, a feat unsurpassed since. The first Gallup poll of his term showed an 80% approval rating. He was a Democrat, and his party had a two-thirds majority in both houses. This gave him authority to push the agenda that had gotten him elected and a Congress unified enough, despite a North/South split in the Democratic party, to tackle even the most divisive issues.

#### Popularity key to political capital

Lee ‘5

(Andrew Lee, Claremont McKenna College, Invest or Spend? Political Capital and Statements of Administration Policy in the First Term of the George W. Bush Presidency, Georgia Political Science Association Conference Proceedings, 2005, <http://a-s.clayton.edu/trachtenberg/2005%20Proceedings%20Lee.pdf>)

How does Congress gauge the credibility of a veto threat? Legislators would gauge the “political capital” of the president to determine the credibility of the threat. According to political journalist Tod Lindberg (2004), political capital is a “form of persuasive authority stemming from a position of political strength” (A21). **Political capital can be measured by favorability and job approval polling numbers because they signify support for the president’s actions and agenda.** For example, President **Bush’s leadership after** the **September 11th** terrorist attacks **increased his favorability and job approval polling, and thus his political capital.** He subsequently was able to launch a war with Afghanistan and Iraq. In such cases, the president’s high political capital would make a veto more credible. Congress must also reckon whether the president will think an issue is worth spending political capital on. As Richard S. Conley and Amie Kreppel (1999) write, “Whenever the President . . . act[s] to change the voting behavior of a Member, political capital is expended. It would not be logical to expend that capital in what was known ahead of time to be a losing battle” (2).

### AT: Public Popularity

#### Public popularity and high approval rating doesn’t influence the agenda.

Bouie ‘11

(Jamelle Bouie, writing fellow at the American Prospect. “Political Capital”. May 5, 2011. The American Prospect. http://prospect.org/csnc/blogs/tapped\_archive?month=05&year=2011&base\_name=political\_capital)

Unfortunately, political capital isn't that straightforward. As we saw at the beginning of Obama's presidency, the mere fact of popularity (or a large congressional majority) doesn't guarantee support from key members of Congress. For Obama to actually sign legislation to reform the immigration system, provide money for jobs, or reform corporate taxes, he needs unified support from his party and support from a non-trivial number of Republicans. Unfortunately, Republicans (and plenty of Democrats) aren't interested in better immigration laws, fiscal stimulus, or liberal tax reform. Absent substantive leverage -- and not just high approval ratings -- there isn't much Obama can do to pressure these members (Democrats and Republicans) into supporting his agenda. Indeed, for liberals who want to see Obama use his political capital, it's worth noting that approval-spikes aren't necessarily related to policy success. George H.W. Bush's major domestic initiatives came before his massive post-Gulf War approval bump, and his final year in office saw little policy success. George W. Bush was able to secure No Child Left Behind, the Homeland Security Act, and the Authorization to Use Military Force in the year following 9/11, but the former two either came with pre-9/11 Democratic support or were Democratic initiatives to begin with. To repeat an oft-made point, when it comes to domestic policy, the presidency is a limited office with limited resources. Popularity with the public is a necessary part of presidential success in Congress, but it's far from sufficient.

#### Popularity not key to the agenda—Obama won’t use it

Mitchell ‘10

(Lincon, Assistant professor in practice at international Law, Columbia university, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/lincoln-mitchell/what-obama-still-can-lear\_b\_450680.html, “What Obama Still Can Learn From Ronald Reagan,” February 5)

Interestingly, although Obama has said that he would rather be a ["good one-term president than a mediocre two-term president"](http://abcnews.go.com/WN/Politics/president-obama-good-term-president/story?id=9657337), he has not governed that way. In fairness to Obama, this statement is something of a meaningless platitude, as it is hard to imagine any president saying anything different on this subject. Nonetheless, **Obama has carefully guarded his popularity, rather than use it to pass legislation**. Critics of Obama have said that he has learned that Washington and public policy is not as easy to change as the president suggested in his campaign. This may be true, but in some respects Obama hasn't tried yet. **Presidential popularity** is a very valuable asset; it may be one of the few sources in the legislative process that a president has, but it **is only valuable if it is used. If it is not used it simply, and naturally, dissipates. This is**, to a great extent, **the story of Obama's first year in office. Rather than push for controversial legislation and see his numbers go down, Obama has soft-pedaled legislation, avoided real confrontation**, and seen his numbers go down. This strategy has accomplished very little as the health care bill, even in its very compromised current form, remains stalled. Meanwhile, Obama's chances of passing progressive legislation on job creation and the economy, assuming that is something he wants to do, are not good. And while the environment for passing this type of legislation will be more difficult in 2010 than it was in 2009, it will still be easier this year than next year when the Democrats will have probably lost seats in November. **Obama's willingness to compromise on important aspects of legislation was exploited by politicians from both parties because they were aware that there would be no consequence for opposing the popular president.** The strategy that Obama should have used in 2009 was one of leveraging his popularity to make it clear to reluctant legislators, particularly Democrats and Republicans from swing districts and states, that voting against the president meant voting against the interests and preferences of their constituents, and of outlining consequences for voting against the president. The best recent example that Obama might follow, perhaps ironically, was set by another president who was more popular than congress. Unlike Obama, however, Ronald Reagan only enjoyed a majority for his party in one chamber of Congress. Reagan's domestic policies were similarly polarizing, but he very effectively used his personal popularity, if not necessarily that of his policies, to pass legislation with an enormous impact on the US. This strategy was central to the transformative nature of the Reagan presidency.

#### Congressional opinion isn’t changed by popularity- studies prove

Bond and Fleisher ’90 – Professors of Political Science

(Jon, Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M University and Richard, Associated Professor of Political Science at Fordham University, The President in the Legislative Arena, pg. 28-29)

In addition, there are theoretical problems. Some of the confusion results from lack of clarity about what the theory linking popularity and presidential support actually predicts. Edwards’s (1980) argument and analysis suggest that presidential popularity exerts strong, direct effects on congressional decision making. Despite Rivers and Rose’s (1985) criticisms of his interpretation, Edwards reports some very strong relationships between partisan public approval and partisan support in Congress which seem to support his conclusions about the importance of presidential popularity. But virtually **every study of congressional behavior suggest that such external forces as public opinion will have marginal effects at best.** Moreover, in his discussion of “presidential prestige” as a source of presidential power, Neustadt (1960, 87) emphasizes that it “**is a factor operating mostly in the background** as a conditioner, **not the determinant, of what Washingtonians will do about a President’s request.”** 9

### Winners Win

#### Winners win.

Green ’10 – Professor of Political Science at Hofstra University

(David Micheal Green, professor of political science at Hofstra University. 6/11/10, " The Do-Nothing 44th President”. http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html)

Moreover, there is a continuously evolving and reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement. In the same way that nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around. This is absolutely a matter of perception, and you can see it best in the way that Congress and especially the Washington press corps fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and George W. Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a steamroller effect and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the winning team. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did.

#### Winners win and spill over to other agenda items

Mitchell ‘10 - Asst Professor of International Law @ Columbia

(Lincon, Assistant professor in practice at international Law, Columbia university, <http://politics.ifoday.com/?tag=Mitchell>, Lincoln Mitchell: Health Care, Financial Reform and Democratic Momentum/ April 28)

A lot has happened since then. Today, while the Republicans are still hoping for big gains in November, the momentum has decidedly shifted. The election of Scott Brown has turned out not to be the knock out punch for the Obama administration which many conservatives had thought, or at least hoped, it would be. However, **the election of** Scott **Brown** was a defining moment for the Obama administration and the party of which he is the leader because it **forced the president and his party to choose between backing away and conceding that their agenda for change**, as modest as it actually is, was too much for the American people, **or redoubling their efforts and commitment to change**. Obama’s decision to choose the latter option may have surprised many, and flown in the face of some of the advice he received, but it was the right decision. This decision immediately became relevant on the issue of health care as the administration, with encouragement from leadership in congress, decided to try to pass the bill in spite of no longer controlling, even nominally, 60 senate seats. **While the bill itself should not be described as a great piece of legislation, the fight was an important one; and Obama’s victory transformed his presidency. It showed America that the President was willing to fight for something and that** in addition to being a brilliant man and great speaker, **he could play political hardball when necessary.** Thus, while the passage of the health care bill has not transformed the Obama administration into the truly progressive presidency for which many had hoped, it has breathed some life back into his presidency and party. Equally significantly Obama has tripped up the Republican Party. Had the health care bill failed, the Tea Partiers and other right wing activists could have had a substantial victory to their credit. This would have strengthened the narrative, and perhaps even the reality, that the Tea Party movement was something genuinely new with the potential to have a transformative effect on the Republican Party and American politics more generally. The failure of the Tea Party movement to stop the Obama health care reform has put an end to much of this conversation. Instead, the Tea Party movement is beginning to be understood as just another radical partisan movement with little transformative power other than of being an albatross around the neck of the Republican Party. The debate around the financial reform bill has also demonstrated that the Republican Party has been caught a little off guard by renewed Democratic vigor and that Republicans may become captives of their own irrational rhetoric. Republicans initially responded to the proposed bill by calling it another bailout. Given the nature of the bill, this rhetoric got little traction so the Republicans quickly abandoned it. The Republican Party, of course, cannot support a bill that goes so clearly against their principle of making rich people richer, but realize that taking a strong position against it will not play in the post health care political reality, so they face a real quandary. In the likely event that this bill passes, President Obama will be able to point to another major piece of domestic legislation almost immediately following the health care bill. The charges of socialism against Obama will not die down after this bill is passed; they may in fact get stronger. These cries, however, will become increasingly irrelevant. Some significant minority of the American people will continue to call Obama socialist almost no matter what, but this is beginning to look less like a problem for Obama and more like one for the Republican’s, as they find themselves controlled by a radical and angry, right wing base. The Democratic Party’s fortunes have taken a turn for the better in the last few months because, for what seems like the first time since Obama took office, the party has been aggressive, refused to back down in the face of Republican attacks and abandoned efforts to pass legislation with bipartisan support. However, **the Republicans can regain the momentum back from the Democrats if the Obama administration is not vigilant about setting the agenda, pushing hard for more legislation and not being intimidated by the Republicans.**

#### Winner’s win for Obama

Singer ‘9

(Jonathan Singer, Editor of My Direct Democracy, March 3, 2009, http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428)

From the latest NBC News-Wall Street Journal survey: Despite the country's struggling economy and vocal opposition to some of his policies, President Obama's favorability rating is at an all-time high. Two-thirds feel hopeful about his leadership and six in 10 approve of the job he's doing in the White House. **"What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks,"** said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, **he stands at the end of this six weeks with as much or more capital in the bank."** Peter Hart gets at a key point. **Some believe that political capital is finite**, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that **political capital can be regenerated** -- and, specifically, that **when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital**. Indeed, **that appears to be what is happening with** Barack **Obama**, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

#### Win’s increase capital- this answers their finite args

Lee ‘5

(Andrew Lee, Claremont McKenna College, Invest or Spend? Political Capital and Statements of Administration Policy in the First Term of the George W. Bush Presidency, Georgia Political Science Association Conference Proceedings, 2005, http://a-s.clayton.edu/trachtenberg/2005%20Proceedings%20Lee.pdf)

To accrue political capital, the president may support a particular lawmaker’s legislation by issuing an SAP urging support, thereby giving that legislator more pull in the Congress and at home. **The president may also receive capital from Congress by winning larger legislative majorities**. For example, the president’s successful efforts at increasing Republican representation in the Senate and House would constitute an increase in political capital. The president may also receive political capital from increased job favorability numbers, following through with purported policy agendas, and defeating opposing party leaders (Lindberg 2004). **Because political capital diminishes, a president can invest in policy and legislative victories to maintain or increase it.** For example, President George W. Bush invests his political capital in tax cuts which he hopes will yield returns to the economy and his favorability numbers. By investing political capital, the president assumes a return on investment.

### AT: Winners Win

#### Winners win is not true for Obama – it must be a large, domestic, and economic victory.

Kuttner ‘11

(Robert Kuttner, co-founder and co-editor of The American Prospect, as well as a distinguished senior fellow of the think tank Demos. “Barack Obama’s Theory of Power”. The American Prospect. May 16, 2011. <http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack_obamas_theory_of_power>)

Obama won more legislative trophies during his first two years than Clinton did, but in many respects, they were poisoned chalices. Health reform proved broadly unpopular because of political missteps—a net negative for Democrats in the 2010 midterm. The stimulus, though valuable, was too small to be a major political plus. Obama hailed it as a great victory rather than pledging to come back for more until recovery was assured. He prematurely abandoned the fight for jobs as his administration’s central theme, though the recession still wracked the nation. And because of the administration’s alliance with Wall Street, Obama suffered both the appearance and reality of being too close to the bankers, despite a partial success on financial reform. Obama’s mortgage-rescue program was the worst of both worlds—it failed to deliver enough relief to make an economic difference yet still signaled politically disabling sympathy for both “deadbeat” homeowners and for bankers. (See this month’s special report on page A1.)

#### Obama Legislative success depletes capital – victories cement opposition

Purdum 10 – Award winning journalist who spent 23 years with the NY Times

(12/20/10, Todd S., Vanity Affair, “Obama Is Suffering Because of His Achievements, Not Despite Them,” <http://www.vanityfair.com/online/daily/2010/12/obama-is-suffering-because-of-his-achievements-not-despite-them.html>)

With this weekend’s decisive Senate repeal of the military’s “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy for gay service members, can anyone seriously doubt Barack Obama’s patient willingness to play the long game? Or his remarkable success in doing so? In less than two years in office—often against the odds and the smart money’s predictions at any given moment—Obama has managed to achieve a landmark overhaul of the nation’s health insurance system; the most sweeping change in the financial regulatory system since the Great Depression; the stabilization of the domestic auto industry; and the repeal of a once well-intended policy that even the military itself had come to see as unnecessary and unfair. So why isn’t his political standing higher? Precisely because of the raft of legislative victories he’s achieved**.** Obama has pushed through large and complicated new government initiatives at a time of record-low public trust in government (and in institutions of any sort, for that matter), and he has suffered not because he hasn’t “done” anything but because he’s done so much—way, way too much in the eyes of his most conservative critics. With each victory, Obama’s opponents grow more frustrated, filling the airwaves and what passes for political discourse with fulminations about some supposed sin or another. Is it any wonder the guy is bleeding a bit? For his part, Obama resists the pugilistic impulse. To him, the merit of all these programs has been self-evident, and he has been the first to acknowledge that he has not always done all he could to explain them, sensibly and simply, to the American public. But Obama is nowhere near so politically maladroit as his frustrated liberal supporters—or implacable right-wing opponents—like to claim. He proved as much, if nothing else, with his embrace of the one policy choice he surely loathed: his agreement to extend the Bush-era income tax cuts for wealthy people who don’t need and don’t deserve them. That broke one of the president’s signature campaign promises and enraged the Democratic base and many members of his own party in Congress. But it was a cool-eyed reflection of political reality: The midterm election results guaranteed that negotiations would only get tougher next month, and a delay in resolving the issue would have forced tax increases for virtually everyone on January 1—creating nothing but uncertainty for taxpayers and accountants alike. Obama saw no point in trying to score political debating points in an argument he knew he had no chance of winning. Moreover, as The Washington Post’s conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer bitterly noted, Obama’s agreement to the tax deal amounted to a second economic stimulus measure—one that he could never otherwise have persuaded Congressional Republicans to support. Krauthammer denounced it as the “swindle of the year,” and suggested that only Democrats could possibly be self-defeating enough to reject it. In the end, of course, they did not. Obama knows better than most people that politics is the art of the possible (it’s no accident that he became the first black president after less than a single term in the Senate), and an endless cycle of two steps forward, one step back. So he just keeps putting one foot in front of the other, confident that he can get where he wants to go, eventually. The short-term results are often messy and confusing. Just months ago, gay rights advocates were distraught because Obama wasn’t pressing harder to repeal “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.” Now he is apparently paying a price for his victory because some Republican Senators who’d promised to support ratification of the START arms-reduction treaty—identified by Obama as a signal priority for this lame-duck session of Congress—are balking because Obama pressed ahead with repealing DADT against their wishes. There is a price for everything in politics, and Obama knows that, too. Finally, Obama is hardly in anything close to disastrous political shape. Yes, the voters administered a shellacking to his party in December, but there are advantages to working with a hostile Republican Congress as a foil, instead of a balky Democratic one as a quarrelsome ally. His own personal likeability rating remains high—much higher than that of most politicians—and his job approval rating hovers at just a bit below 50 percent, where it has held for more than a year, nowhere near the level of a “failed presidency.” Sarah Palin’s presence for the moment assures an uncertain and divided Republican field heading into the 2012 election cycle, and the one man who could cause Obama a world of trouble if he mounted an independent campaign—Mayor Mike Bloomberg of New York—has recently made statements of non-candidacy that sound Shermanesque (even as he has remained outspokenly critical of business as usual by both parties in Washington).

#### Obama’s use of the bully pulpit and combative speeches fail.

- George Edwards, the director of the Center for Presidential Studies, at Texas A. & M

Klein 3/19

Ezra Klein. “The Unpersuaded: Who Listen’s to the President”. March 19, 2012. The New Yorker. http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2012/03/19/120319fa\_fact\_klein?currentPage=all

No Speaker of the House had ever refused a President’s request to address a joint session of Congress, but the House Republicans refused to budge, and the back-and-forth, which was dominating and delighting the political news media, threatened to overwhelm the President’s message on jobs. In the end, Obama agreed to speak on the eighth. He was in a combative mood, and, after a summer in which the Republicans had driven the economic debate, with their brinkmanship over the debt ceiling, the Democrats were thrilled to see him take back the legislative initiative. When the TV ratings came in, the White House was relieved: with thirty-one million viewers, the President had beaten the N.F.L. But, in the days following the speech, Obama’s approval rating was essentially unchanged—according to a Gallup poll, it actually dropped a percentage point. The audience, apparently, had not been won over. Neither had Congress: the American Jobs Act was filibustered in the Senate and ignored in the House. The White House attempted to break the act into component parts, but none of the major provisions—expanded payroll-tax cuts, infrastructure investment, and a tax credit for businesses that hired unemployed workers—have passed. The President’s effort at persuasion failed. The question is, could it have succeeded? In 1993, George Edwards, the director of the Center for Presidential Studies, at Texas A. & M. University, sponsored a program in Presidential rhetoric. The program led to a conference, and the organizers asked their patron to present a paper. Edwards didn’t know anything about Presidential rhetoric himself, however, so he asked the organizers for a list of the best works in the field to help him prepare. Like many political scientists, Edwards is an empiricist. He deals in numbers and tables and charts, and even curates something called the Presidential Data Archive. The studies he read did not impress him. One, for example, concluded that “public speech no longer attends the processes of governance—it is governance,” but offered no rigorous evidence. Instead, the author justified his findings with vague statements like “One anecdote should suffice to make this latter point.” Nearly twenty years later, Edwards still sounds offended. “They were talking about Presidential speeches as if they were doing literary criticism,” he says. “I just started underlining the claims that were faulty.” As a result, his conference presentation, “Presidential Rhetoric: What Difference Does It Make?,” was less a contribution to the research than a frontal assault on it. The paper consists largely of quotations from the other political scientists’ work, followed by comments such as “He is able to offer no systematic evidence,” and “We have no reason to accept such a conclusion,” and “Sometimes the authors’ assertions, implicit or explicit, are clearly wrong.” Edwards ended his presentation with a study of his own, on Ronald Reagan, who is generally regarded as one of the Presidency’s great communicators. Edwards wrote, “If we cannot find evidence of the impact of the rhetoric of Ronald Reagan, then we have reason to reconsider the broad assumptions regarding the consequences of rhetoric.” As it turns out, there was reason to reconsider. Reagan succeeded in passing major provisions of his agenda, such as the 1981 tax cuts, but, Edwards wrote, “surveys of public opinion have found that support for regulatory programs and spending on health care, welfare, urban problems, education, environmental protection and aid to minorities”—all programs that the President opposed—“increased rather than decreased during Reagan’s tenure.” Meanwhile, “support for increased defense expenditures was decidedly lower at the end of his administration than at the beginning.” In other words, people were less persuaded by Reagan when he left office than they were when he took office. Nor was Reagan’s Presidency distinguished by an unusually strong personal connection with the electorate. A study by the Gallup organization, from 2004, found that, compared with all the Presidential job-approval ratings it had on record, Reagan’s was slightly below average, at fifty-three per cent. It was only after he left office that Americans came to see him as an unusually likable and effective leader. According to Edwards, Reagan’s real achievement was to take advantage of a transformation that predated him. Edwards quotes various political scientists who found that conservative attitudes peaked, and liberal attitudes plateaued, in the late nineteen-seventies, and that Reagan was the beneficiary of these trends, rather than their instigator. Some of Reagan’s closest allies support this view. Martin Anderson, who served as Reagan’s chief domestic-policy adviser, wrote, “What has been called the Reagan revolution is not completely, or even mostly, due to Ronald Reagan. . . . It was the other way around.” Edwards later wrote, “As one can imagine, I was a big hit with the auditorium full of dedicated scholars of rhetoric.” Edwards’s views are no longer considered radical in political-science circles, in part because he has marshalled so much evidence in support of them. In his book “On Deaf Ears: The Limits of the Bully Pulpit” (2003), he expanded the poll-based rigor that he applied to Reagan’s rhetorical influence to that of nearly every other President since the nineteen-thirties. Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s fireside chats are perhaps the most frequently cited example of Presidential persuasion. Cue Edwards: “He gave only two or three fireside chats a year, and rarely did he focus them on legislation under consideration in Congress. It appears that FDR only used a fireside chat to discuss such matters on four occasions, the clearest example being the broadcast on March 9, 1937, on the ill-fated ‘Court-packing’ bill.” Edwards also quotes the political scientists Matthew Baum and Samuel Kernell, who, in a more systematic examination of Roosevelt’s radio addresses, found that they fostered “less than a 1 percentage point increase” in his approval rating. His more traditional speeches didn’t do any better. He was unable to persuade Americans to enter the Second World War, for example, until Pearl Harbor. No President worked harder to persuade the public, Edwards says, than Bill Clinton. Between his first inauguration, in January, 1993, and his first midterm election, in November, 1994, he travelled to nearly two hundred cities and towns, and made more than two hundred appearances, to sell his Presidency, his legislative initiatives (notably his health-care bill), and his party. But his poll numbers fell, the health-care bill failed, and, in the next election, the Republicans took control of the House of Representatives for the first time in more than forty years. Yet Clinton never gave up on the idea that all he needed was a few more speeches, or a slightly better message. “I’ve got to . . . spend more time communicating with the American people,” the President said in a 1994 interview. Edwards notes, “It seems never to have occurred to him or his staff that his basic strategy may have been inherently flawed.” George W. Bush was similarly invested in his persuasive ability. After the 2004 election, the Bush Administration turned to the longtime conservative dream of privatizing Social Security. Bush led the effort, with an unprecedented nationwide push that took him to sixty cities in sixty days. “Let me put it to you this way,” he said at a press conference, two days after the election. “I earned capital in the campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it.” But the poll numbers for privatization—and for the President—kept dropping, and the Administration turned to other issues. Obama, too, believes in the power of Presidential rhetoric. After watching the poll numbers for his health-care plan, his stimulus bill, his Presidency, and his party decline throughout 2010, he told Peter Baker, of the Times, that he hadn’t done a good enough job communicating with the American people: “I think anybody who’s occupied this office has to remember that success is determined by an intersection in policy and politics and that you can’t be neglecting of marketing and P.R. and public opinion.” The annual State of the Union address offers the clearest example of the misconception. The best speechwriters are put on the task. The biggest policy announcements are saved for it. The speech is carried on all the major networks, and Americans have traditionally considered watching it to be something of a civic duty. And yet Gallup, after reviewing polls dating back to 1978, concluded that “these speeches rarely affect a president’s public standing in a meaningful way, despite the amount of attention they receive.” Obama’s 2012 address fit the pattern. His approval rating was forty-six per cent on the day of the speech, and forty-seven per cent a week later.

#### Health care and energy prove winners don’t win – capital is finite

Lashof ‘10

(Dan Lashof, director of the National Resource Defense Council's climate center, Ph.D. from the Energy and Resources Group at UC-Berkeley, 7-28-2010, NRDC Switchboard Blog, "Coulda, Shoulda, Woulda: Lessons from Senate Climate Fail," http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/dlashof/coulda\_shoulda\_woulda\_lessons.html)

Lesson 2**: Political capital is not necessarily a renewable resourc**e. Perhaps the most fateful decision the Obama administration made early on was to move **healthcare** reform **before energy** and climate legislation. I’m sure this **seemed like a good idea** at the time. Healthcare reform was popular, was seen as an issue that the public cared about on a personal level, and was expected to unite Democrats from all regions. White House officials and Congressional leaders reassured environmentalists with their theory that success breeds success. A quick victory on healthcare reform would renew Obama’s political capital, some of which had to be spent early on to push the economic stimulus bill through Congress with no Republican help. Healthcare reform was eventually enacted, but **only after an exhausting battle that eroded public support, drained political capital and created the Tea Party movement. Public support** for healthcare reform **is slowly rebounding** as some of the early benefits kick in and people realize that the forecasted Armageddon is not happening. **But this is occurring too slowly to rebuild Obama’s political capital in time to help push climate legislation across the finish line.**

#### Wins won’t spillover—political circumstances are different

Robinson ‘10

(Gordon Robinson, a writer and commentator who has covered the Middle East for ABC News, CNN and Fox since the 1980s. He teaches Middle East Politics at the University of Vermont and has taught Islamic History at Emerson College. “Obama returns to winning ways”. Gulf News. December 29, 2010)

If there is a single lesson for the president to take away from the last few weeks it is not to make the mistake of paying much attention to the praise: those in the media who are smitten by him today will go back to calling him incompetent and out of touch the moment something goes wrong, as it inevitably will. **Many of Obama's wins** over the last few weeks **were built on unique political dynamics unlikely to be recreated any time soon.** Take, for example, the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with Russia (commonly known as ‘New START'). Optimists have spent the last few days pointing to Obama's successful wooing of 13 Republicans, a total that put the treaty comfortably over the minimum needed for ratification. The fact that he achieved this despite opposition from most of the Senate's Republican leaders was certainly a virtuoso performance, but **it would be a mistake to read it as a hint of better things to come.** Peeling off all of those Republicans required pleas for ‘yes' votes from every single living former Republican secretary of state, former president George W. Bush and most of the top officers in the military. Even then, the outcome remained in doubt until almost the last minute. As recently as two weeks ago the treaty was widely presumed to be dead. **If this is what it takes to get a real bipartisan measure** **through the Senate do not look for it to serve as a model for much of anything** **during the coming year. It is difficult, if not impossible, to imagine a similar set of circumstances coming together again any time soon.**

#### Capital is finite

Francis ‘9

(Theo Francis, writer for Business Week, 3-19- 2009, “Team Obama Runs the Offense” http://www.businessweek.com/bwdaily/dnflash/content/mar2009/db20090313\_686911.htm?chan=top+news\_top+news+index+-+temp\_news+%2B+analysis)

Economics aside, **Obama's political strategy is becoming clear: Seize the opportunity** that the crisis, and his high popularity, offers him, **and tackle multiple fronts** both to accomplish as much as possible **as quickly as possible**, and to keep opponents off balance. "**Their theory is that popularity is a very perishable commodity, and indeed it is," says** **Larry Sabato, director of the University of Virginia's Center for Politics**. "That is especially true for Presidential popularity in crisis mode—**use it or lose it. … It can't be conserved**."

### Losers Lose Internals

#### Losers lose- tanks the agenda

Galston and Kamarck ‘8

(William Galston and Elaine Kamarck, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution and Lecturer in Public Policy at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, “Change You Can Believe In Needs a Government You Can Trust: A Third Way Report,” November, http://www.thirdway.org/data/product/file/176/Third\_Way\_-\_Trust\_in\_Government\_Report.pdf)

On **day one of the Reagan presidency, the hostages came home from Iran. This success**, though arguably not of President Reagan’s making, enhanced one of his central narratives—the importance of strength and resolve—**and helped set the stage for the passage of his historic tax cut. By contrast**, President Bill **Clinton's opening days were marred by failed appointments to key positions, controversies over executive decisions, and a poorly conceived economic stimulus plan** that lingered for months before succumbing. **These early stumbles took the luster off the new administration, reinforced a negative impression of chaos and inexperience, and lowered the president’s approval rating, all of which complicated the task of enacting key proposals.**

#### More evidence – perception of wins or losses key

Ornstein ‘1

(Norman, American Enterprise Institute, September 10, LN)

The compromise accomplished two ends. First, it changed the agenda base of the issue. Patients' rights went from an issue where the only viable proposal was from Democrats (with GOP co-sponsors), which the President vowed to veto - to one where both Democrats and Bush are for patients' rights and merely differ on the details. Two, **it gave the President a victory** on the House floor when all the pundits predicted defeat - **a major momentum builder**. In a system where a President has limited formal power, **perception matters. The reputation for success - the belief by other political actors that** even when he looks down, **a president will find a way to pull out a victory - is the most valuable resource a chief executive can have**. Conversely, **the widespread belief that the Oval Office occupant is on the defensive,** on the wane or without the ability to win under adversity **can lead to disaster**, as individual lawmakers calculate who will be on the winning side and negotiate accordingly. In simple terms**, winners win and losers lose more often than not.**

#### Losers lose

Ornstein ‘93

(Norman, Roll Call, April 27, LN)

But the converse is also, painfully, true. **If a president develops a reputation for being weak or for being a loser**—somebody who says, “Do this!” and nothing happens, **who is ignored or spurned by other interests** in the political process—**he will suffer death by a thousand cuts. Lawmakers will delay jumping on his bandwagon, holding off as long as possible until they see which side will win**. Stories about incompetence, arrogance, or failure will be reported always, and given prominence, because they prove the point.

### AT: Losers Lose

#### Losses don’t suck- Presidents can still get their agenda

Weisberg ‘5

(Jacob, Bush’s First Defeat, March 31, 2005, http://www.slate.com/id/2115141/)

This means that **Bush is about to suffer**—and is actually in the midst of suffering—**his first major political defeat**. After passing all his most important first-term domestic priorities (a tax cut, an education-reform bill, domestic security legislation, another tax cut), Bush faces a second term that is beginning with a gigantic rebuke: **A Congress solidly controlled by his own party is repudiating his top goal. It's precisely what happened to** Bill **Clinton**, when Congress rejected his health-care reform proposal in 1993. As the Clinton example shows, **such a setback doesn't doom an administration**. But **how Bush handles the defeat is likely to be a decisive factor in determining whether he accomplishes any of the other big-ticket items on his agenda.**

### Obama Push

#### Obama sets the agenda

Maisel ‘9

(L. Sandy Maisel is director of the Goldfarb Center for Public Affairs and Civic Engagement at Colby College, Obama: Agent of Change or Compromiser in Chief, May 20, 2009, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sandy-maisel/obama-agent-of-change-or_b_205664.html>)

He assumes that the opposition will come around if the nation accepts his tone. But **he and his staff also know the legislative process. The issues on the** table in the months ahead -- health care and energy policy, closing of Guantanamo, changing the face of our military, education policy, the list is all but endless -- **will require working across the partisan aisles in Congress. Obama has shown he is ready to do that** -- and if he is successful, he might not get the whole loaf, but he will get much more than others anticipate. The United States government -- political scientists have been teaching their students for generations -- involves separated institutions sharing powers. **The President is clearly the agenda setter, but he is not**, as President Bush tried to be, "**the decider**." In Richard Neustadt's classic phrase, which President Kennedy never forgot, "**presidential power is the power to persuade.**" The verdict on Obama is clearly still out, but the early returns are positive.

#### President pushes the plan

Edwards and Barrett ‘2k

(George C. Edwards, Professor of Political Science at Texas A&M University and director of the Center for Presidential Studies in the Bush School and Andrew W. Barrett, Assistant Lecturer and Ph.D. candidate in political science at Texas A&M University, 2000, Polarized Politics: Congress and the President in a Partisan Era, Ed. by Bond and Flesicher)

For decades, scholars have maintained that **the president has** a signifi-cant—indeed, **the most significant—role in setting the policy-making agenda** in Washington (see, for example, Huntington 1973). John King-don’s careful study of the Washington agenda found that **“no other sin-gle actor in the political system has quite the capability of the president to set agendas…the president can single handedly set the agendas, not only of people in the executive branch, but also of people in Congress and out-side the government”** (1995, 23). Frank Baumgartner and Bryan Jones, in their broad examination of agenda setting, concluded that “no other single actor can focus attention as clearly, or change the motivations of such a great number of other actors, as the president” (1993, 241). Jon Bond and Richard Fleisher argue that “**the president’s greatest influence over policy comes from the agenda he pursues and the way it is packaged”** (1990, 23).

### Executive Agencies Link

#### Obama will be held accountable

Tisdall ‘9

(Simon Tisdall, The Guardian, World briefing In a White House full of advisers and tsars, can Obama's management style work?, February 18, 2009, LN)

Before becoming president, Barack **Obama** had not really run anything much. Now he **is chair**man **and chief executive of one the world's biggest organisations - the US federal government.** According to the Bureau of Labour Statistics, **the government and its myriad agencies employ nearly 1.8 million people. For all of them, be they Democrats, Republicans or unaffiliated, Obama is the boss**. If **Obama** is daunted by this responsibility and his lack of management experience, it does not show. Even before his $787bn stimulus package was approved by Congress, he **had become a** one-man **job creation programme.** By one estimate, 160 people will work in the West Wing, compared with 60 under Bush.

#### Obama accountable for executive agencies- stimulus proves

Star-Ledger ‘9

Mayors warned to spend wisely, February 21, 2009, LN

In the days since the White House and Congress came to terms on the $787 billion economic package, the political focus has shifted to how it will work. **Obama has staked his reputation** not just on the promise of 3.5 million jobs saved or created, but also **on a pledge to let the public see where the money goes. His budget chief** this week released a 25,000-word document that **details exactly how Cabinet and executive agencies,** states and local organizations **must report spending**. It is a system meant to streamline reports so they can be displayed on the administration's new website, Recovery.gov. **Using his presidential pulpit, Obama demanded accountability, from his friends in local government as well as his own agencies.** He said the new legislation gives him tools to "watch the taxpayers' money with more rigor and transparency than ever," and that he will use them. "**If a federal agency proposes a project that will waste that money, I will not hesitate to call them out on it**, and put a stop to it," **he said**. "I want everyone here to be on notice that if a local government does the same**, I will** call them out on it, and **use the full power of my office and our administration to stop it."**

#### The president is accountable for agency policy making

Seidenfeld ‘94

(Mark, Associate Professor at Florida State University College of Law, Iowa Law Review, October, LN)

**Unlike the courts and even the agencies themselves, the President is [\*13] directly elected and hence politically accountable**. Thus, we should expect presidential influence on agency decision-making to constrain agency policy to conform to democratically determined values. Furthermore, **the President is the unique official who is answerable to the entire electorate. Consequently, the President stands to pay a price if his policies benefit special interest groups to the detriment of society as a whole**.

### Executive Orders cost PC

#### The controversy of the program determines whether or not the counterplan draws criticism- still links to politics

Cox and Rodriguez ‘9

(Adam Cox and Cristina Rodriguez, Assistant Professor of Law at NYU Law, Professor of Law at NYU Law, “The President and Immigration Law,” 2009, Yale Law Journal)

One might suspect that the Bracero program came to an end as 1947 drew to a close, in the face of the program’s expiration and Congress’s failure to pass legislation either extending the program or delegating to the relevant agencies the power to authorize the program, In fact, however, the admission of temporary workers stopped for only a short time. On February 21, 1948, the State Department arranged a new accord with Mexico and labor importation resumed. No statute authorized this new accord. And unlike the initiation of the program in 1942, Congress did not pass a statute in the following months. **The Bracero program continued to operate** from 1948 until 1951 without any statutory sanction. During this period, the Executive managed the movement of labor into the United States administratively, sometimes in controversial ways. In 1948, for example, hundreds of workers clamored for entry at the border after the Mexican government decided to permit U.S. growers to recruit 2000 workers from border towns, and the INS opened the border for a weekend.72

#### Executive orders create a lightning rod on the whitehouse—cp links to politics

Cooper 97

(Phillip, Prof of Public Administration @ Portland State, Nov 97, “Power tools for an effective and

responsible presidency” Administration and Society, Vol. 29, p. Proquest)

Interestingly enough, the effort to avoid opposition from Congress or agencies can have the effect of turning the White House itself into a lightning rod. When an administrative agency takes action under its statutory authority and responsibility, its opponents generally focus their conflicts as limited disputes aimed at the agency involved. Where the White House employs an executive order, for example, to shift critical elements of decision making from the agencies to the executive office of the president, the nature of conflict changes and the focus shifts to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue or at least to the executive office buildings. The saga of the OIRA battle with Congress under regulatory review orders and the murky status of the Quayle Commission working in concert with OIRA provides a dramatic case in point.

#### Executive action causes massive Republican backlash.

Clark ‘11

(Lesley Clark, Reporter for McClatchy Newspapers. McClatchy. September 4, 2011. “Obama can't create many jobs without Congress' help, analysts say”.

http://www.kansascity.com/2011/09/04/3120221/obama-cant-create-many-jobs-without.html)

But Republicans in Congress are dead set against any big new spending program, and they control the House of Representatives, so the prospect of no big new jobs program rolling out of Washington before 2013 looms large. In light of that, is there anything else Obama can do on his own to spur job creation? Probably nothing significant. The White House says there are some steps the executive branch can take without congressional approval, but independent analysts - even those who are pressing Obama to make an ambitious case in his address Thursday for a sweeping job-creation package - say the magnitude of the nation's problems is so large that it's beyond anything the executive branch can do on its own. "I know it's tempting to look for a man-on-a-white-horse response to this situation as a way out of the gridlock between the two parties ... but we have to solve this as a country," said William Galston, a former policy adviser to President Bill Clinton and a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, a center-left policy research center. Galston said presidents had executive power they could use to "speed things up or slow things down" within existing programs, "but if you try to do things that go beyond what Congress has authorized, particularly right now with the partisan polarization so intense, I don't think it would get very far." The Constitution gives Congress primary power over taxes and spending. Congress gives money to the executive branch designated for specific purposes. The president isn't empowered to take money appropriated for, say, the Pentagon, and spend it instead on a new jobs program of his own design. When past presidents have tried to exert economic powers beyond what's given to them by Congress and the Constitution, they've gotten slapped down. President Harry Truman tried to take over the steel industry, citing a national emergency, but the Supreme Court ruled the action unconstitutional, Galston noted. Richard Nixon tried to "impound" money that Congress had appropriated rather than spend it as intended, but Congress struck back with a budget act that constrained him and effectively denied him the power. Galston suggested that 90 to 95 percent of what Obama will recommend "will require someone else's consent," namely Congress. Republicans say there's plenty Obama could do, beginning with embracing tax cuts, revoking federal regulations that they say handcuff business - and abandoning any push for more federal spending to spark job creation. House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, on Friday blamed sluggish private-sector job growth on the "triple threat of higher taxes, more failed 'stimulus' spending and excessive federal regulations." "Together, these Washington policies have created a fog of uncertainty that's left small businesses unable to hire and American families worried about the future." White House officials and the economists they rely on say the economy needs feeding, not starvation. Obama is under pressure from liberal groups to push for an aggressive fix for the jobs crunch, and not to settle for recommending only a limited agenda tailored to what the administration thinks Congress would accept. "The best thing he could do is to explain how serious the crisis is, that we're on the precipice of a decade-long calamity," said Len Burman, a tax official who served in the Treasury Department under Clinton and co-founded the Tax Policy Center in Washington. "He should explain the severity, and that because of that, the economy needs extraordinary measures. This is a classic situation where government needs to spend to make up for the lack of demand in the economy." However, Republicans oppose that prescription as a rule, so any Obama recommendation for new spending faces an uphill climb, if not a slammed door.

### At: Bottom of the Docket

#### Congress doesn’t have a docket—New legislation can go right to the top of the agenda—otherwise they could never act in an emergency

Kraljik 11

(Dave, Voteacracy Understanding Congress Part 3 of 7: How are laws are made

http://www.votetocracy.com/blog/detail/understanding-congress-part-3-of-7:-how-are-laws-are-made.html)

The business of the Senate (bills and resolutions) is not divided into classes as a basis for their consideration, nor are there calendar days set aside each month in the Senate for the consideration of particular bills and resolutions. The nature of bills has no effect on the order or time of their initial consideration. “The Senate, like the House, gives certain motions a privileged status over others and certain business, such as conference reports, command first or immediate consideration, under the theory that a bill which has reached the conference stage has been moved a long way toward enactment and should be privileged when compared with bills that have only been reported. “At any time the Presiding Officer may lay, or a Senator may move to lay, before the Senate any bill or other matter sent to the Senate by the President or the House of Representatives, and any pending question or business at that time shall be suspended, but not displaced.

### AT: Plan is a Tradeoff

#### Even shifting funding pisses off House republicans.

Clark ‘11

(Lesley Clark, Reporter for McClatchy Newspapers. McClatchy. September 4, 2011. “Obama can't create many jobs without Congress' help, analysts say”.

http://www.kansascity.com/2011/09/04/3120221/obama-cant-create-many-jobs-without.html)

But Republicans in Congress are dead set against any big new spending program, and they control the House of Representatives, so the prospect of no big new jobs program rolling out of Washington before 2013 looms large. In light of that, is there anything else Obama can do on his own to spur job creation? Probably nothing significant. The White House says there are some steps the executive branch can take without congressional approval, but independent analysts - even those who are pressing Obama to make an ambitious case in his address Thursday for a sweeping job-creation package - say the magnitude of the nation's problems is so large that it's beyond anything the executive branch can do on its own. "I know it's tempting to look for a man-on-a-white-horse response to this situation as a way out of the gridlock between the two parties ... but we have to solve this as a country," said William Galston, a former policy adviser to President Bill Clinton and a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, a center-left policy research center. Galston said presidents had executive power they could use to "speed things up or slow things down" within existing programs, "but if you try to do things that go beyond what Congress has authorized, particularly right now with the partisan polarization so intense, I don't think it would get very far." The Constitution gives Congress primary power over taxes and spending. Congress gives money to the executive branch designated for specific purposes. The president isn't empowered to take money appropriated for, say, the Pentagon, and spend it instead on a new jobs program of his own design. When past presidents have tried to exert economic powers beyond what's given to them by Congress and the Constitution, they've gotten slapped down. President Harry Truman tried to take over the steel industry, citing a national emergency, but the Supreme Court ruled the action unconstitutional, Galston noted. Richard Nixon tried to "impound" money that Congress had appropriated rather than spend it as intended, but Congress struck back with a budget act that constrained him and effectively denied him the power. Galston suggested that 90 to 95 percent of what Obama will recommend "will require someone else's consent," namely Congress. Republicans say there's plenty Obama could do, beginning with embracing tax cuts, revoking federal regulations that they say handcuff business - and abandoning any push for more federal spending to spark job creation. House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, on Friday blamed sluggish private-sector job growth on the "triple threat of higher taxes, more failed 'stimulus' spending and excessive federal regulations." "Together, these Washington policies have created a fog of uncertainty that's left small businesses unable to hire and American families worried about the future." White House officials and the economists they rely on say the economy needs feeding, not starvation. Obama is under pressure from liberal groups to push for an aggressive fix for the jobs crunch, and not to settle for recommending only a limited agenda tailored to what the administration thinks Congress would accept. "The best thing he could do is to explain how serious the crisis is, that we're on the precipice of a decade-long calamity," said Len Burman, a tax official who served in the Treasury Department under Clinton and co-founded the Tax Policy Center in Washington. "He should explain the severity, and that because of that, the economy needs extraordinary measures. This is a classic situation where government needs to spend to make up for the lack of demand in the economy." However, Republicans oppose that prescription as a rule, so any Obama recommendation for new spending faces an uphill climb, if not a slammed door.

#### Budget tradeoff will invite backlash from Congress

Spence 4-- co-founder of the Truman National Security Project, a national security leadership development institute based in Washington, DC.

(Matthew, Policy Coherence and Incoherence: The Domestic Politics of American Democracy Promotion, Workshop on Democracy Promotion Center for Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law Stanford University October 4-5, 2004, http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/20741/Spence-\_CDDRL\_10-4\_draf1.pdf)

Fourth, U.S. domestic politics created some disincentives for effective programs. Bureaucratic inertia kept programs alive that many USAID officials felt were foolish. Grantees and contractors had few incentives to report failing projects—even if an intransigent government was to blame—because their income came from continuing a project. In Kyrgyzstan, for example, through 1999 a foreign contractor voluntarily ended only one project, because the host government was not cooperating as expected. 45 Some USAID-funded groups had patrons on the Hill, whom they could appeal to when their funds were threatened. This added tensions to the relationship between USAID officials and their grantees. 46

## \*\*\*Links\*\*\*

### Plan Unpop (Generic)

#### Transportation spending drains capital – election magnifies the link

Szakonyi ‘12

(Mark Szakonyi is an Associate Editor for the Journal of Commerce – focusing on the reporting of rail and intermodal issues, regulation and policy out of the JOC's Washington, D.C., bureau. Journal of Commerce – March 20, 2012 – lexis)

House Republicans are considering a short-term extension of the surface transportation bill instead of adopting the Senate's two-year plan. The decision to seek an extension as the March 31 deadline nears signals that the fight over transportation spending could become even more partisan as the presidential election nears. House Republicans are looking to push an extension of current spending for the ninth time, House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John Mica, R.-Fla., told attendees of an American Association of Port Authorities conference, where he was honored as Port Person of the Year. His statement on Tuesday was a clear sign that Republicans won't heed Senate leaders' and President Obama's call to adopt the Senate's $109 billion plan. Mica said he hoped the extension would be exempt from riders, which helped lead to a shutdown of the Federal Aviation Administration last summer .

#### Generically, Transportation Infrastructure Spending drains capital – escalates fights with GOP.

Tomasky ‘11

(Newsweek/Daily Beast special correspondent Michael Tomasky is also editor of Democracy: A Journal of Ideas – Newsweek – September 19, 2011 – lexis)

Finally, Barack Obama found the passion. "Building a world-class transportation system is part of what made us an economic superpower," he thundered in his jobs speech on the evening of Sept. 8. "And now we're going to sit back and watch China build newer airports and faster railroads? At a time when millions of unemployed construction workers could build them right here in America?" Obama's urgency was rightly about jobs first and foremost. But he wasn't talking only about jobs when he mentioned investing in America--he was talking about our competitiveness, and our edge in the world. And it's a point he must keep pressing. In a quickly reordering global world, infrastructure and innovation are key measures of a society's seriousness about its competitive drive. And we're just not serious. The most recent infrastructure report card from the American Society of Civil Engineers gives the United States a D overall, including bleak marks in 15 categories ranging from roads (D-minus) to schools and transit (both D's) to bridges (C). The society calls for $2.2 trillion in infrastructure investments over the next five years. On the innovation front, the country that's home to Google and the iPhone still ranks fourth worldwide in overall innovation, according to the Information Technology & Innovation Foundation (ITIF), the leading think tank on such questions, which conducts a biannual ranking. But we might not be there for long. In terms of keeping pace with other nations' innovation investments--"progress over the last decade," as ITIF labels it--we rank 43rd out of 44 countries. What's the problem? It isn't know-how; this is still America. It isn't identifying the needs; they've been identified to death. Nor is it even really money. There are billions sitting around in pension funds, equity funds, sovereign wealth funds, just waiting to be spent. The problem--of course--is politics. The idea that the two parties could get together and develop bold bipartisan plans for massive investments in our freight-rail system--on which the pro-business multiplier effects would be obvious--or in expanding and speeding up broadband (it's eight times faster in South Korea than here, by the way) is a joke. Says New York University's Michael Likosky: "We're the only country in the world that is imposing austerity on itself. No one is asking us to do it." There are some historical reasons why. Sherle Schwenninger, an infrastructure expert at the New America Foundation, a leading Washington think tank, says that a kind of anti-bigness mindset developed in the 1990s, that era in which the besotting buzzwords were "Silicon Valley" and "West Coast venture capital." Wall Street began moving away from grand projects. "In that '90s paradigm, the New Economy-Silicon Valley approach to things eschewed the public and private sectors' working together to do big things," Schwenninger says. "That model worked for software, social media, and some biotech. But the needs are different today." That's true, but so is the simple point that the Republican Party in Washington will oppose virtually all public investment. The party believes in something like Friedrich von Hayek's "spontaneous order"--that is, get government off people's backs and they (and the markets they create) will spontaneously address any and all problems. But looking around America today, can anyone seriously conclude that this is working?

#### Spending for infrastructure empirically causes fights

White 6/27

(It's Make Or Break For Infrastructure Money As Transportation Bill Deadline Looms By [Jeremy B. White](http://www.ibtimes.com/archives/articles/reporters/jeremy-b-white/): Subscribe to Jeremy's [RSS feed](http://www.ibtimes.com/rss/articles/reporters/jeremy-b-white.rss) 6/27, 2012 12:25 PM EDT)

[Congress](http://www.ibtimes.com/topics/detail/920/congress/) is running out of time to pass a transportation bill. If lawmakers cannot forge an agreement, they will need to fund projects on the nation's roads and bridges with a stopgap measure. [Congress](http://www.ibtimes.com/topics/detail/920/congress/) last passed a surface transportation bill in 2005, and since that bill expired in 2009 lawmakers have enacted nine straight short-term extensions. They now have until June 30th to avert a scenario in which construction projects come to a halt as money for them dries up -- something neither party wants to happen. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, Democrat of Nevada, upped the pressure on Tuesday, saying a deal needed to happen on Wednesday in order to leave enough time to get the bill to President Obama before the current pot of funding evaporates. "We have to have an agreement by tomorrow," Reid said on Tuesday. "Otherwise, we can't get the bill done." Congress' failure to pass a long-term surface transportation bill at a time when the nation's deteriorating infrastructure [earned](http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/) a "D" grade from the American Society of Civil Engineers has emerged as a symbol of dysfunction on Capitol Hill. President Obama has repeatedly stressed investments in infrastructure as a means to stimulate the economy and produce jobs, but to no avail. Disagreements about how to pay for the bill have been part of the problem. Last time around, House Republicans rejected a Senate bill in part because they said that federal gasoline tax revenue, the traditional source of funding for surface transportation projects, was insufficient. They pushed to have new offshore drilling included, saying the royalties from new projects would help cover the shortfall. The Keystone XL pipeline also continues to be a sticking point -- Obama has put the project on hold pending an environmental review, but Republicans want transportation legislation to include a mechanism that would accelerate the natural gas pipeline. They also want to ease restrictions on coal-ash pollution. Another possibility is that the transportation bill gets rolled into separate legislation that would prevent interest rates on student loans from doubling. Senate leaders said on Tuesday that they had completed work on the student loan bill and kept alive the possibility that transportation language could be included.

#### Transportation policy ensures loss of political capital – party demographics prove

Freemark ‘11

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “Understanding the Republican Party’s Reluctance to Invest in Transit Infrastructure”

January 25th, 2011 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/01/25/understanding-the-republican-partys-reluctance-to-invest-in-transit-infrastructure/)

Conservatives in Congress threaten to shut down funding for transit construction projects and investments in intercity rail. One doesn’t have to look far to see why these programs aren’t priorities for them. Late last week, a group of more than 165 of the most conservative members of the House of Representatives, the Republican Study Committee, released a report that detailed an agenda to reduce federal spending by $2.5 trillion over ten years. Spurred on by increasing public concern about the mounting national debt, the group argues that the only choice is to make huge, painful cuts in government programs. With the House now in the hands of the Republican Party, these suggestions are likely to be seriously considered. Transportation policy is prominent on the group’s list, no matter President Obama’s call for investments in the nation’s transportation infrastructure, expected to be put forward in tonight’s state of the union address. Not only would all funding for Amtrak be cut, representing about $1.5 billion a year, but the Obama Administration’s nascent high-speed rail program would be stopped in its tracks. A $150 million commitment to Washington’s Metro system would evaporate. Even more dramatically, the New Starts program, which funds new rail and bus capital projects at a cost of $2 billion a year, would simply disappear. In other words, the Republican group suggests that all national government aid for the construction of new rail or bus lines, intercity and intra-city, be eliminated. These cuts are extreme, and they’re not likely to make it to the President’s desk, not only because of the Democratic Party’s continued control over the Senate but also because some powerful Republicans in the House remain committed to supporting public transportation and rail programs. But how can we explain the open hostility of so many members of the GOP to any federal spending at all for non-automobile transportation? Why does a transfer of power from the Democratic Party to the Republicans engender such political problems for urban transit? We can find clues in considering the districts from which members of the House of Representatives of each party are elected. As shown in the chart above (in Log scale), there was a relatively strong positive correlation between density of congressional districts and the vote share of the Democratic candidate in the 2010 elections. Of densest quartile of districts with a race between a Democrat and a Republican — 105 of them, with a density of 1,935 people per square miles or more — the Democratic candidate won 89. Of the quartile of districts with the lowest densities — 98 people per square mile and below — Democratic candidates only won 23 races. As the chart below demonstrates (in regular scale), this pattern is most obvious in the nation’s big cities, where Democratic Party vote shares are huge when densities are very high. This pattern is not a coincidence. The Democratic Party holds most of its power in the nation’s cities, whereas the GOP retains greater strength in the exurbs and rural areas. The two parties generally fight it out over the suburbs. In essence, the base of the two parties is becoming increasingly split in spatial terms: The Democrats’ most vocal constituents live in cities, whereas the Republicans’ power brokers would never agree to what some frame as a nightmare of tenements and light rail. What does this mean? When there is a change in political power in Washington, the differences on transportation policy and other urban issues between the parties reveal themselves as very stark. Republicans in the House of Representatives know that very few of their constituents would benefit directly from increased spending on transit, for instance, so they propose gutting the nation’s commitment to new public transportation lines when they enter office. Starting two years ago, Democrats pushed the opposite agenda, devoting billions to urban-level projects that would have been impossible under the Bush Administration. Highway funding, on the other hand, has remained relatively stable throughout, and that’s no surprise, either: The middle 50% of congressional districts, representing about half of the American population, features populations that live in neighborhoods of low to moderate densities, fully reliant on cars to get around. It is only in the densest sections of the country that transit (or affordable housing, for instance) is even an issue — which is why it appears to be mostly of concern to the Democratic Party. Republicans in the House for the most part do not have to answer to voters who are interested in improved public transportation. This situation, of course, should be of significant concern to those who would advocate for better transit. To put matters simply, few House Republicans have any electoral reason to promote such projects, and thus, for the most part they don’t. But that produces a self-reinforcing loop; noting the lack of GOP support for urban needs, city voters push further towards the Democrats. And sensing that the Democratic Party is a collection of urbanites, those from elsewhere push away. It’s hard to know how to reverse this problem. Many Republicans, of course, represent urban areas at various levels of government. No Democrat, for instance, has won the race for New York’s mayoralty since 1989. And the Senate is a wholly different ballgame, since most states have a variety of habitation types. As Bruce McFarling wrote this week, there are plenty of reasons for Republicans even in places of moderate density to support such investments as intercity rail. But the peculiar dynamics of U.S. House members’ relatively small constituent groups, in combination with the predilection of state legislatures to produce gerrymandered districts designed specifically to ensure the reelection of incumbents, has resulted in a situation in which there is only one Republican-controlled congressional district with a population density of over 7,000 people per square mile. And that’s in Staten Island, hardly a bastion of urbanism. With such little representation for urban issues in today’s House leadership, real advances on transport issues seem likely to have to wait.

### Transportation disliked by Republicans

#### Republicans dislike federal spending for infrastructure programs-support tolls

Sledge 12,

(Matt, Huffington Post reporter, “Gop Candidates’ Transportation Infrastructure Talk Praises Tolls But Ignores Jobs”, 1/4/12, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/01/04/gop-candidates-transportation-infrastructure-jobs\_n\_1184314.html Accessed:6/25/12)

Republicans, by contrast, view transportation as either a local issue or "a sector that ought to stand on its own feet, in other words pay for itself, in other words through tolls or other fees," Orski said. If there is one thing that GOP candidates Mitt Romney and Newt Gingrich seem to agree on, it's those "user fees." If a road's worth building, the argument goes, people will be willing to pay for it themselves through tolls. That argument mirrors one advanced by the Department of Transportation during the Bush administration, which, [according to the Washington Post](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/03/16/AR2008031603085_pf.html), operated under the guiding principle that "unleashing the private sector and introducing market forces could lead to innovation and more choices for the public." The result was "a legacy of new toll roads across the country." In a 2008 speech outlining his infrastructure "principles," [unearthed by Streetsblog](http://dc.streetsblog.org/2011/12/20/who-said-it-%E2%80%9Clets-be-really-bold-in-developing-maglev-trains%E2%80%9D/), former House Speaker Gingrich (R-Ga.) said the country should "when possible shift to user fees rather than tax increases.

#### Republicans oppose new desperately needed funding for transportation

**Primack, 11**

(Dan Primack senior editor for the Washington Post February 17, 2011 <http://finance.fortune.cnn.com/2011/02/17/why-obama-cant-save-infrastructure/>)

It is an important step, considering that the American Society of Civil Engineers estimates that the nation's 5-year infrastructure investment need is approximately $2.2 trillion. Unfortunately, Obama didn't explain how the new spending would be paid for. Increases in transportation infrastructure spending traditionally have been paid for via gas tax increases, but today's GOP orthodoxy is to oppose all new revenue generators (even if this particular one originated with Ronald Reagan). This isn't to say that Republicans don't believe the civil engineers – it's just that they consider their version of fiscal discipline to be more vital. In other words, America's infrastructure needs are stuck in a holding pattern. That may be sustainable for a while longer, but at some point we need to land this plane or it's going to crash.

### Transportation Bipartisan

#### Bipartisanship Reached in Transportation Sector

Transportation and Infrastructure 2012 Official (Government report <http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/singlepages.aspx/911>)

In 2012, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee approved a long-term initiative to put Americans back to work, particularly in the hard-hit construction industry, by rebuilding our nation's crumbling roads, bridges and transportation infrastructure. This measure, the American Energy & Infrastructure Jobs Act (H.R. 7), would set long-term national surface transportation policy, provide for infrastructure improvement projects across the country, and make much needed transportation program reforms. The bill, introduced in the House by Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John L. Mica and Highways and Transit Subcommittee Chairman John J. Duncan, Jr., was approved by the Committee on February 3, 2012. In March 2012, Congress approved a short-term extension of current transportation programs in order to ensure projects across the country would not shut down and thousands of Americans would not lose their jobs. This extension was the ninth short-term extension of programs since the previous long-term transportation law expired in September 2009. Six of the previous short-term extensions were approved under a Democratic Congress and Administration. In April 2012, the House approved transportation legislation that includes important provisions not contained in the Senate bill, and voted to begin resolving differences between the measures approved by each body. The first meeting between House and Senate conferees charged with completing final transportation legislation was held on May 8th, and on June 21st, Chairman Mica and Senator Boxer announced conferees are continuing to move forward toward a bipartisan, bicameral agreement. Key House provisions not contained in the Senate’s bill include: Cutting the red tape in the project approval process. It takes an average of 15 years to complete a major highway project. Much of that time is taken up by a needlessly inefficient and time-consuming review process. The House bill will get infrastructure improvement projects moving by making common sense reforms to project reviews, and help reduce costs to taxpayers by ensuring that projects get completed more efficiently. We can cut the project review time in half, ensuring that jobs and transportation improvements are not put on hold. Click here to see a graph depicting the streamlining reforms under the House bill. Ensuring funds collected to improve the nation’s harbors are used for their intended purpose. Our nation’s ports are vital to the economy, and millions of jobs throughout the country are dependent upon the commercial shipping industry. Unfortunately, much of the funds collected in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund are not invested for the maintenance and improvement of our nation’s harbors. Instead these funds are used to disguise other unrelated federal spending while our harbors become choked and congested. The House bill directs that these funds be spent for their intended purpose. Keystone Pipeline project approval. The House bill will remove barriers to domestic energy production, help lower energy costs, and create jobs for Americans by approving the Keystone XL pipeline. The House and Senate continue to work towards final legislation that will provide longer-term stability for projects and jobs, and provide necessary reforms to the nation’s transportation programs. Other areas of reform proposed by the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee: Streamlining federal transportation programs. Currently there are more than 130 federal programs, many of which are duplicative or unnecessary. The Committee supports reducing the federal bureaucracy by consolidating or eliminating approximately 70 programs and federal mandates, and giving states more authority to determine which projects to undertake. Increasing states’ flexibility in determining their most critical transportation needs. The Committee supports reforming the federal government's intrusive, one-size-fits-all approach and returning more gas tax revenues to the state and local level. States need more authority to determine their most critical transportation needs - not Washington bureaucrats. Encouraging private sector participation. Resources for improving the nation's transportation infrastructure are limited, and the Committee supports maximizing our available resources by encouraging responsible private sector participation in financing and rebuilding our infrastructure. Eliminating earmarks. The Committee proposal does not contain earmarks. By comparison, the previous surface transportation law contained over 6,300 earmarks.

### Alternative Fuels Popular

#### Fuel Efficient Cars are popular amongst Democrats and some Republicans

Auto World News 6/19

(Auto World News delivers the latest news on auto industries and products, including photos, videos, and car reviews [http://www.autoworldnews.com/articles/1803/20120619/energy-savings-fuel-efficiency-public-opinion-ap-poll-republicans-democrats.htm 06/19/12](http://www.autoworldnews.com/articles/1803/20120619/energy-savings-fuel-efficiency-public-opinion-ap-poll-republicans-democrats.htm%2006/19/12))

A recent Associated Press [survey](http://www.apnorc.org/Common/pdfs/AP-NORC-Energy-Report.pdf) found the American public is largely split 50-50, often along party lines, on energy issues such as the importance of low gas prices, possible limitations on energy consumption, and the savings of buying a fuel-efficient vehicle. When it comes to the government's role in energy and fuel savings, Americans were very much split along party lines. More than 75 percent of polled Democrats said they are in favor of consumer incentives to purchase energy-saving products, such as fuel efficient cars. More than 50 percent of Democrats also favored "regulations that would limit how much energy things like cars and appliances can use." Many Replublicans disagree. Just over 40 percent of polled Republicans supported consumer incentives for energy saving vehicles and appliances, and only 25 percent would be OK with regulations on the energy (or fuel) consumption of cars and appliances. The poll also found Americans were quite knowledgable on how much they can save by reducing fuel and energy consumption. Sixty one percent said they thought buying a fuel efficient vehicle is the best energy saving technique of seven that were listed. It was best. According to the poll, driving a fuel efficent vehicle saves you more than buying better insulation for your home or turning down the thermostate from 72 to 68 during winter. However, nearly half of respondents said it would be extremely difficult to purchase a vehicle that gets 31 miles per gallon, as opposed to driving one that gets 20 miles per gallon. The study also found that a slight majority of Americans, particularly those under 50, believed the U.S. would not be able to stop buying energy from other countries in 50 years.

### Alternative Fuels Unpopular

#### Supporting Alternative transportation drains capital – Election demographics prove

Freemark ‘12

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – February 6th, 2012 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/06/time-to-fight/)

With a House like this, what advances can American transportation policy make? Actions by members of the U.S. House over the past week suggest that Republican opposition to the funding of alternative transportation has developed into an all-out ideological battle. Though their efforts are unlikely to advance much past the doors of their chamber, the policy recklessness they have displayed speaks truly poorly of the future of the nation’s mobility systems. By Friday last week, the following measures were brought to the attention of the GOP-led body: The Ways and Means Committee acted to eliminate the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund, destroying public transportation’s source of steady federal financing for capital projects, first established in the 1980s. The members of the committee determined that to remedy the fact that gas taxes have not been increased since 1993,\* the most appropriate course was not to raise the tax (as would make sense considering inflation, more efficient vehicles, and the negative environmental and congestion-related effects of gas consumption) but rather to transfer all of its revenues to the construction of highways. Public transit, on the other hand, would have to fight for an appropriation from the general fund, losing its traditional guarantee of funding and forcing any spending on it to be offset by reductions in other government programs.\*\* This as the GOP has made evident its intention to reduce funding for that same general fund through a continued push for income tax reductions, even for the highest earners. The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee approved a transportation reauthorization bill on partisan lines (with the exception of one Republican who voted against it, Tom Petri of Wisconsin) that would do nothing to increase funding for transportation infrastructure in the United States over the next five years despite the fact that there is considerable demand for a large improvement in the nation’s road, rail, and transit networks just to keep them in a state of good repair, let alone expand them to meet the needs of a growing population. The committee voted to eliminate all federal requirements that states and localities spend 10% of their highway funding on alternative transportation projects (CMAQ), such as Safe Routes to School, sidewalks, or cycling infrastructure, despite the fact the those mandated investments are often the only ones of their sort that are actually made by many states. The committee eliminated the Obama Administration’s trademark TIGER program, which has funded dozens of medium-scale projects throughout the country with a innovative merit-based approach. Instead, virtually all decisions on project funding would be made by state DOTs, which not unjustly have acquired a reputation as only interested in highways. Meanwhile, members couldn’t resist suggesting that only “true” high-speed rail projects (over 150 mph top speed) be financed by the government — even as they conveniently defunded the only such scheme in the country, the California High-Speed Rail program. The same committee added provisions to federal law that would provide special incentives for privatization of new transportation projects — despite the fact that there is no overwhelming evidence that such mechanisms save the public any money at all. And under the committee’s legislation, the government would provide extra money to localities that contract out their transit services to private operators, simply as a reward for being profit-motivated. Meanwhile, House leadership recommended funding any gaps in highway spending not covered by the Trust Fund through a massive expansion in domestic energy production that would destroy thousands of acres of pristine wilderness, do little for decreasing the American reliance on foreign oil, and reaffirm the nation’s addiction to carbon-heavy energy sources and ecological devastation. New energy production of this sort is highly speculative in nature and would produce very few revenues in the first years of implementation. As a special treat, the same leadership proposed overruling President Obama’s decision to cancel the Keystone XL pipeline by bundling an approval for it into the transportation bill. This litany of disastrous policies were endorsed by the large majority of Republicans on each committee, with the exception of two GOP members in House Ways and Means\*\*\* and one in the Transportation Committee who voted against the bill, though the vote was entirely along party lines for an amendment attempting to reverse course on the elimination of the Mass Transit Account. Fortunately, these ideas are unlikely to make it into the code thanks to the Senate, whose members, both Democratic and Republican, have different ideas about what makes an acceptable transportation bill. I’ll get back to that in a bit. The House’s effort to move forward on a new multiyear federal transportation bill — eagerly awaited by policy wonks for three years — follows intense and repeated Republican obstructions of the Obama Administration’s most pioneering efforts to alter the nation’s transportation policy in favor of investments that improve daily life for inhabitants of American metropolitan areas. As part of that process, federally funded high-speed rail, streetcar, and transit center projects have been shot down by local politicians as a waste of money, even as road construction has continued apace. The Tea Party’s zany obsession with the supposed U.N. plot to take over American land use decisions through Agenda 21 seems to have infected GOP House members and even presidential contenders. Michele Bachmann’s claim in 2008 that Democrats are attempting to force people onto light rail lines to travel between their housing “tenements” and government jobs may have made it into the mind of Newt Gingrich, who recently made the claim that the “elite” in New York City who ride the subway and live in high-rise condos don’t understand “normal” Americans. What kind of language is this? In the Senate, there is clear evidence that the hard-core proposals of the House will not become law. The upper body’s Environment and Public Works Committee unanimously endorsed a different type of transportation reauthorization, one that would last only two years but that would reform and simplify the grants provided by the Department of Transportation so that they are more based on merit in such matters as ecological sensitivity and the creation of livable communities. Similarly, in the Senate Banking Committee, the transit portion of the proposed bill (approved unanimously) would maintain funding guarantees and allow transit agencies to use federal dollars for operations spending during periods of high unemployment, which would be an excellent policy if pushed into law. How the Senate will be able to compromise with the House in time for the March 31st deadline set by the current legislation is up in the air. The strange and laudable part of the Senate side of the story — at least as compared to the House — is the bipartisan nature of decision-making there. Why are Republicans in the Senate promoting a transportation bill that explicitly would promote multimodalism as a goal, in a contrast to the highway focus of their peers in the House? Why are they accepting environmental criteria as appropriate measures of quality in transportation policy? Perhaps the Democratic Party’s control of the Senate makes fighting such ideas a waste of time. Or perhaps longer Senate terms in office allow clearer, more reasonable thinking. Whatever the reason, in the long-term, it is hard to envision reversing the continued growth of the GOP’s strident opposition to sustainable transportation investments in the House. As I have documented, density of population correlates strongly and positively with the Democratic Party vote share in Congressional elections; the result has been that the House Republicans have few electoral reasons to articulate policies that benefit cities. Those who believe in the importance of a sane transportation policy need to make more of an effort to advance a sane transportation politics to residents of suburban and rural areas, who also benefit from efforts to improve environmental quality, mobility alternatives, and congestion relief, but perhaps are not yet convinced of that fact. Doing so would encourage politicians hoping for votes outside of the city core — Democratic or Republican — to promote alternatives to the all-highways meme that currently rules the GOP in the House.

#### Alt. Transportation Fuel is unpopular with Congress

Vagus, June 23rd

(Stephen Vagus Author in the Daily Chronicle of the Advancements in Hydrogen Fuel Cell Technology 06/23/12 www.hydrogenfuelnews.com/biofuels-losing-support-u-s-government/854367/ )

U.S. military continues to push for the adoption of alternative energy despite political turmoil. The U.S. military is one of the largest consumers of fossil-fuels in the world. Over the past two years, the Department of Defense has made an effort to shift the country’s focus away from fossil-fuels, citing energy as a major national security issue. While the agency is not necessarily looking to reduce the country’s consumption of fuel, it is looking to make alternative energy a more prominent focus. Biofuel has been among the agency’s interests in this endeavor, but may no longer hold traction in the political world as the U.S. Congress continues to push to ban the purchasing of biofuels that are priced to compete with oil. Study shows that biofuels and other renewable energies are losing support A new study from the RAND Corporation, a non-profit group that aims to improve government policies through research and analysis, shows that biofuels and alternative energy in general, are faced with difficult financial problems that are hampering their growth. Currently, the price to produce biofuels is relatively high when compared with fossil-fuels. Though the Department of Defense is a major consumer of fossil-fuels, it does not have the market presence to influence the price of biofuels and make them more alluring to consumers and businesses. As such, the agency has been unsuccessful in promoting the adoption of alternative energy amongst the country’s politicians. Congress mulls measure to ban the purchase of alternative energy The study, which was commissioned by the U.S. Air Force, is a response to a recent measure introduced to Congress. The measure would block the Department of Defense from purchasing biofuels and other sources of renewable fuel. The measure was introduced by Congressman Howard McKeon, who claimed that the country’s military should not be spending more on alternative energy systems than it should be on traditional fuels. Short-term monetary gain may trump long-term sustainability for the country The RAND study also suggests that the U.S. Air Force and Navy are vital to the stability of the oil industry as these two branches are capable of ensuring the safety of sea-based transportation. The study notes that the Department of Energy is concerned with the long-term implications of the finite nature of fossil-fuels, but that Congress is more concerned with the potential for short-term, monetary gain.

#### Obama’s Clean Energy Administration is highly unpopular

O’Keefe, June 25th

(William O’Keefe Chief Executive Officer of the Marshall Institute, is President of Solutions Consulting, Inc. He has also served as Senior Vice President of Jellinek, Schwartz and Conolly, Inc., Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of the American Petroleum Institute and Chief Administrative Officer of the Center for Naval Analyses. <http://fuelfix.com/blog/2012/06/25/the-slowly-sinking-clean-energy-policy/> 06/25/12)

The Obama Administration’s clean energy program is reminiscent of the Titanic after it hit the iceberg.  It is taking on water, the crew has no idea of what to do, and the band plays on. Germany and other EU clean energy advocates are facing up to the reality that they can’t right their economies while heavily subsidizing the so called clean energies that are not commercially viable and are an economic dead weight.  In spite of this, President Obama continues to push his clean energy program as the key to our economic future, job creation, and energy independence.  Over a 3 year period, spending on so called clean energy technologies more than doubled–$17.9 billion in FY-2007 to $37.2 in FY-2010.The environmental community and rent-seeker continue to support his policy but unfortunately, the analytical community has jumped ship.The Brookings Institution, never known as a bastion of conservative thought, recently produced a report, Clean Energy: Revisiting the Challenges of Industrial Policy, that represents another blow to the President’s vision. It takes a hard look at the major reasons proponents give for subsidizing their favored energy systems.  The first involves the need to remediate market failures that have not been corrected by other policies.  A second set of reasons is less about correcting inefficient market outcomes than about tilting the market toward U.S. interests.  The report makes clear that this Administration has not learned the lessons of passed flawed industrial policy initiatives.The history of industrial policy in energy is a sad one.  Since the 1970s, money has been wasted with only rent-seekers benefiting at the public’s expense.  The political pressures mentioned by Brookings have resulted in crony capitalism.  Whether it is worse now is a separate issue for study.  What does not need to be studied is its corrosive effect and the obvious economic damage to a struggling economy.Instead of  picking winners like the Obama Administration has tried to do, according to Brookings, “federal R&D efforts (should) invest in technologies with the lowest expected cost of abatement and the highest probability of market penetration.”  What the Administration has done instead is allocate over 43% of nearly $40 billion dollars to “two sectors with some of the highest abatement costs and lowest projected market shares: solar power and electric vehicles.”The point is also made that “ the caprice of the marketplace frustrates energy planning.  So does the fact that public decisions regarding which producers to favor are all but impossible to insulate from political pressures”.  One of the Brookings conclusions is that “while a case can be made that subsidizing clean energy policy might help address market failures, the case may be narrower than some assert, and turning theory into sound practice is no simple feat.”  There is an abundance of empirical evidence demonstrating that Brookings was being charitable.Technology and energy economics are the main drivers for determining when a new technology is commercially viable.  People like the President who don’t care for fossil energy keep underestimating how strongly they are embedded in our economy because of economics and utility.  Fracking has resulted in an abundance of natural gas that will slowly replace coal for power generation and will have a role as a transportation fuel.  The current alternatives to gasoline and diesel for transportation are too costly with the current technology and no breakthroughs are on the horizon.  Our future is best used by making full use of what we have and making smart R&D investments as Brookings suggests

### Coast Guard/Water Infrastructure—unpopular

#### Coast guard and water infrastructure unpopular—most department cuts and bureaucracy problems

Turner, 10—Washington columnist

(Douglas Turner, Washington columnist for Buffalo News, August 21, 2010, Buffalo News, “Douglas Turner: It’s irresponsible to cut Coast Guard funding”, http://www.buffalonews.com/editorial-page/columns/douglas-turner/article37860.ece)

A couple of weeks ago, Rep. John Mica, R-Fla., called the cuts in Coast Guard funding in President Obama’s budget “a recipe for disaster.” Mica said Obama’s proposed $100 million cuts for antiterrorism offshore, port and waterway security are “irresponsible and unacceptable.” Lieberman, now an Independent, and Mica, had one thing in common when they protested. They were both in the minority and powerless. The regular Pentagon armed forces — the Army, Navy, Marines and Air Force — are getting a 3 percent increase in spending, not counting Obama’s wars in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. The Coast Guard, a foster child in five departments over its 220-year history, is getting slashed despite 17 new tasks thrust on it since 9/11. The Coast Guard suffers from a chronic influence deficiency. Unlike the four other armed services that have collected a massive complex of support from weapons makers, the Coast Guard is a bureaucratic step-child. It has no chief of staff at the Pentagon. Instead it has been shuttled in recent years from the Treasury to the Transportation Department, and now is buried deep in the Homeland Security Department.

Coast guard funding unpopular—budget requests

Hasson, 9

(Judi Hasson, journalist, March 18, 2009, Fierce Government IT, “Obama kills funding for GPS backup”, http://www.fiercegovernmentit.com/story/obama-kills-funding-gps-backup/2009-03-18)

President Obama's proposed 2010 budget cuts out funding for a backup to the Global Positioning System. The money had been part of the Department of Homeland Security budget to fund the Long Range Navigation System, or Loran-C, a terrestrial navigation system the Coast Guard operates. Terminating the system would save the government $36 million in fiscal 2010 and $190 million during a five-year period, according to the budget analysis. But critics say the backup is an essential part of the nation's basic infrastructure, and far more than just a directional tool for motorists to avoid getting lost. DHS spokesman Larry Orluskie described Loran-C as an "an antiquated navigation system" no longer required by the armed forces, the transportation sector or the nation's security interests."

### Gas Tax – Congress Obstructs

#### Congress obstructs on gas tax

NPR 6/26

(Congress Taking Student Loans, Highway Bill To Wire by Andrea Seabrook 6/26/12, (All Things Considered) Copyright 2012 National Public Radio. To see more, visit http://www.npr.org/.)

Congressional leaders say they are close to a deal on two issues with looming deadlines. But if Congress fails to lock down agreements this week, the federal highway program would come to a halt, and student loan interest rates would double. Congressional leaders on Tuesday said they were close to a deal to solve two big issues facing lawmakers — student loan interest rates and federal highway funding. Both issues with looming deadlines have high stakes for middle-income Americans: If Congress fails to reach agreements by this weekend, the federal highway program would come to a halt, and student loan interest rates would double, to 6.8 percent. Student Loans President Obama has been hammering on the issue of student loans for days. "This issue didn't come out of nowhere; it's been looming for months," Obama said last week. "But we've been stuck watching Congress play chicken with another deadline." This should be a no-brainer, the president said. If Congress doesn't act by July 1, more than 7 million students would see their interest rates double, costing them an average of $1,000 more per year. Even more perplexing is the fact that almost everyone in Congress seems to agree that the interest rates should stay down. So what's the problem? Well, how to pay for it. That's the root of just about every conflict in Congress these days. And it shows just how much the coming election plays into this year's policy debates. Republicans want to pay for the lower interest rate by cutting money from health care programs. Democrats want to raise payroll taxes on wealthier Americans. The Highway Bill Then, there's the highway legislation. It's a massive bill — worth more than $100 billion to fund infrastructure projects for the next two years. It means thousands of construction jobs, and that's one reason three-quarters of the Senate voted for it earlier this year. But in the House? Well, here's what Speaker John Boehner, the Ohio Republican, said after meeting with negotiators from his own party last week. "They've been heavily engaged, and clearly there's some movement that's been under way," said Boehner, before quickly changing the subject during a Q-and-A with reporters. "So, we're continuing to do our work. Listen, the American people deserve the truth about what happened in 'Fast and Furious.' " House Republicans seem far more interested in talking about the Justice Department's botched sting operation and a possible Thursday vote on whether to hold Attorney General Eric Holder in contempt of Congress. Meanwhile, as negotiators try to work out thorny problems like construction spending and gasoline taxes, Washington's anti-tax guru has been lobbying Republicans hard, behind the scenes. Grover Norquist, the head of Americans for Tax Reform, reminded many GOP lawmakers last week of their pledge not to raise taxes on anything, ever. Norquist exacted this pledge from nearly every Republican freshman elected in 2010. Sen. Richard Durbin, D-Ill., the Senate's No. 2 Democrat, says that stance could jeopardize the highway bill altogether. "All the good bipartisan work in the Senate is going to go for naught if the House Republicans, particularly the Tea Party Republicans, are gonna wait for the thumbs up from Grover Norquist," says Durbin. When Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, the Kentucky Republican, announced Tuesday afternoon that a deal was near on both standoffs, he had very little to say about the details. He couldn't even say whether Congress would actually pass a highway bill or just extend the current one until after November's election: "That, to my knowledge, is not yet resolved, as to whether that will be some kind of extension or a full multiyear bill, but those two could end up together." By "those two" he meant the highway funding and the student loan interest rate bill. Negotiators are now debating whether to roll these two issues together and take one big vote on them. That might be easier, considering the huge distractions still to come this week: the Holder contempt vote, and Thursday's expected Supreme Court decision on the health care law. As House Democratic leader Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., put it, this week "so many things are coming together. Or not."

#### Congress split over tax cuts

**New York Times, June 6th**

(Summers adds fuel to tax cut debate Article by: JONATHAN WEISMAN , New York Times Updated: 6/6**,** 2012 - 8:58 PM)

Congressional Republicans pounced Wednesday on disputed comments from Bill Clinton and a former senior Obama economic adviser, claiming that the Republican push to extend all of the Bush-era tax cuts beyond the 2012 expiration date has support at the highest levels of the Democratic Party. White House officials and congressional Democrats responded just as vigorously, saying neither the former president nor Lawrence Summers, a past director of the National Economic Council, ever said that all of the tax cuts should be extended. The exchange illustrated how politically sensitive the tax cut expiration has become in the wake of fresh data showing the economy slowing. A majority of voters say the federal budget deficit should be tackled with a mix of spending cuts and tax increases on the rich. In an April New York Times/CBS News poll, 56 percent favored boosting the economy by spending on education and infrastructure while raising taxes on the wealthy, against 37 percent who favored cutting taxes and spending. But Republicans have stood firm against any tax increase, and they are on the offensive, thanks in part to the confusing economic comments of Clinton and Summers. "Even Bill Clinton came out for it, before he was against it," said Speaker John Boehner. Both Democrats released statements shortly after their televised interviews denying they had said that they favored extending all the tax cuts. President Obama has endorsed extending tax cuts for the middle class, but he has promised to oppose any extension of Bush-era tax cuts for households earning more than $250,000. But after Friday's surprisingly weak jobs report for May, the Democrats have found themselves on the defensive. Rep. Peter Welch, D-Vt., who wants his party to stand its ground, said: "There's a reason to be alarmed. Historically, economic sentiment in May predicts the outcome of presidential elections, and people are edgy." In the morning appearance on MSNBC's "Morning Joe" program that sparked the exchange, Summers appeared to signal that he favors a temporary extension of all the tax cuts. After host Mika Brzezinski mentioned Clinton's tax cut comments, Summers responded: "The real risk to this economy is on the side of slowdown, certainly not on the side of overheating, and that means we've got to make sure we don't take gasoline out of the tank at the end of this year. That's got to be the top priority." A few minutes later, he added, "For the medium and long term, we obviously have to do things to control the deficit," explicitly embracing tax increases on the rich." Together, the comments appeared to suggest that Summers opposed allowing any tax cuts to expire at the end of the year and preferred allowing the cuts on income above $250,000 to expire later. But he later said: "I fully support President Obama's position on tax cuts." Those events mirrored the dispute over Clinton's comments barely 12 hours before. In an interview on CNBC, Clinton appeared to say tax increases and Republican-led spending cuts should be temporarily set aside until the economy regains its footing. His spokesman later said the former president does not believe tax cuts for the wealthy need be extended.

### Gas Tax—Public Supports

#### Public supports gas tax

Transportation Institute ‘10

([Yes, You Can Move the Needle on Public Support for a Gas Tax Hike](http://streetsblog.net/2010/07/07/yes-you-can-move-the-needle-on-public-support-for-a-gas-tax-hike/) by [Ben Fried](http://streetsblog.net/author/benf/) Transportation Institute Wednesday, July 7, 2010 http://streetsblog.net/2010/07/07/yes-you-can-move-the-needle-on-public-support-for-a-gas-tax-hike/)

Last week, USA Today reported rather gleefully that [the U.S. gas tax has never been lower](http://www.usatoday.com/money/industries/energy/2010-07-01-gas-tax_N.htm). Having remained unchanged at 18.4 cents per gallon since 1993, American drivers are now paying half as much in inflation-adjusted gas taxes, per 1,000 miles driven, as they did in 1975. We can pretty much forget about investing in new and expanded transit systems — or even just holding up our bridges — as long as this is the case. USA Today also cited a recent national survey by the Mineta Transportation Institute, which pegged public support for a 10-cent gas tax increase at a paltry 23 percent. Thanks to a post from Streetsblog Network member [TrailBlog](http://community.railstotrails.org/blogs/trailblog/archive/2010/07/06/american-s-opinions-on-transportation-tax-options.aspx?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+RTCTrailBlog+%28RTC+TrailBlog%29), penned by Steve Schweigerdt of the Rails to Trails Conservancy, we have a more complete — and interesting — picture of what this survey actually revealed. Schweigert reports from a recent panel discussion about the survey: A couple key points from the survey were that: Linking transportation tax to environmental benefits will increase support, specifically if the tax helps address global warming. Support for gas taxes can be significantly increased with good program design. The panelists portrayed the gas tax increase as a needed short-term fix, but a restructuring of transportation financing is necessary for long-term investment in the system. William Millar [of the American Public Transit Association] reminded the audience that we shouldn’t assume that the way things are can never change. We spent the last 60 years building the system we have, he said, and we can spend the next 60 building a better system. You can [download the survey results here](http://transweb.sjsu.edu/project/2928.html). Of particular note: Support for the 10-cent gas tax hike rose to 42 percent if the revenue would be spent to reduce global warming. The survey also gauged public opinion on a mileage tax, finding that support increased from 21 percent to 33 percent if the rate would vary according to the fuel efficiency of the vehicle. Tellingly, Americans seem more willing to tax everything they purchase than to pay for transportation infrastructure by taxing driving: A half-cent national sales tax enjoyed the highest support of all the options given, at 43 percent. But the big takeaway from the Mineta survey is that a national gas tax hike gains support if you make a strong case for how the revenue will be spent. Should some national political figure come along and deliver a compelling public message that we need to raise the gas tax to invest in cleaner, more efficient transportation, move us away from oil addiction, and keep our existing infrastructure from falling apart, who knows, maybe you could break the 50 percent threshold. Of course, seeing as how most Americans mistakenly [already think the gas tax goes up regularly](http://www.infrastructurist.com/2010/01/21/how-often-is-the-gas-tax-raised-most-americans-have-no-clue/), and gas prices have [fluctuated within a 24-cent range](http://gasbuddy.com/gb_retail_price_chart.aspx) in just the last three months, you could also reach the conclusion espoused in [this classic Infrastructurist post](http://www.infrastructurist.com/2009/06/19/a-solution-to-transporation-bill-standoff-just-raise-the-ing-gas-tax-already/): Just raise the g-dd-mned gas tax already.

### Gas Tax unpopular with public

#### Gas tax unpopular with the public

Reason.org ‘11

(77 Percent of Americans Oppose Raising the Gas Tax, Reason-Rupe Transportation Poll Finds Poll finds a majority of voters support tolls over taxes to pay for roads and favor using public-private partnerships to build critical infrastructure Reason.org Dec. 20, 2011)

A majority of Americans believe new transportation projects should be paid for with user-fees instead of tax increases, according to a new national Reason-Rupe poll of 1,200 adults on cell phones and land lines. The Reason-Rupe poll finds 77 percent of Americans oppose increasing the federal gas tax, while just 19 percent favor raising the tax, which is currently 18.4 cents a gallon. The public thinks the government wastes the gas tax money it already receives. Sixty-five percent say the government spends transportation funding ineffectively, and just 23 say the money is spent effectively. The survey shows Americans believe new roads and highways should be paid for by the people driving on them: 58 percent of Americans say new roads and highways should be funded by tolls. Twenty-eight percent say new road capacity should be paid for by tax increases. The Reason-Rupe poll finds broad support for user-fees. If a toll road would save drivers a “significant” amount of time, 59 percent of Americans say they would pay to use it. And 57 percent favor converting carpool lanes, or high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, into high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes. Voters are much-less supportive of variably-priced toll lanes, however. Half of those surveyed oppose, and 39 percent favor, variably-priced tolls that rise and fall with traffic levels. In terms of transportation spending priorities, 62 percent want to prioritize funding for road and highway projects, while 30 percent want to prioritize funding for mass transit projects. As the debate over high-speed rail continues in California and elsewhere, a solid majority of Americans, 55 percent, say the private sector should build high-speed train systems where it thinks riders will pay to use rail. Just 35 percent of Americans believe federal and state governments should build high-speed rail systems where they think the trains are needed. As governments at all levels look for ways to pay for transportation projects, public officials should note that 55 percent of Americans support using public-private partnerships to build critical infrastructure projects. Just 35 percent oppose using public-private partnerships to fund highways, airports and other infrastructure. The National Transportation Safety Board has called for a ban on cell phones while driving and 69 percent of Americans tell Reason-Rupe that talking on a cell phone while driving should be illegal. Even more, 89 percent, say texting while driving should be illegal. The poll did not ask about using hands-free devices. Full Poll Online The complete Reason-Rupe survey is online at <http://reason.com/poll> and <http://reason.org/files/reason_rupe_transportation_poll.pdf>. This Reason-Rupe poll, conducted December 3-13, 2011, surveyed a random, national sample of 1,200 adults by telephone (777 on landlines, 423 on cell phones). The results have a margin of error of plus or minus 3 percentage points. The poll was conducted for Reason Foundation by NSON Opinion Strategy. This is part of a series of Reason-Rupe public opinion surveys dedicated to exploring what Americans really think about government and major issues. This Reason Foundation project is made possible thanks to the generous support of the Arthur N. Rupe Foundation.

### GPS—unpopular

#### GPS unpopular—bipartisan budget cuts

National Coordination Office for Space-Based PNT, 11

(National Coordination Office for Space-Based PNT, the central node within the government for gps-related policy matters, October 2011, “Information for Policymakers from the National Coordination Office

for Space-Based Positioning, Navigation, and Timing (PNT)”, http://www.gps.gov/congress/newsletter/2011/10.pdf)

The Senate Appropriations Committee passed its defense spending bill (H.R. 2219) on September 15, cutting FY 2012 funds from the next-generation GPS space and control segments. The bill would cut $40 million in advance procurement of GPS III satellite components and $24 million for development of the Next Generation Operational Control System (OCX). House and Senate appropriators have recommended deep cuts to DOT’s GPS line item, which pays for civil- unique elements of GPS modernization. The House THUD bill would slash $31.3 million from the $50.3 million account, while the Senate version (S. 1596) proposes a $14.3 million reduction. The House bill would also strip $40.5 million from FAA’s Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS), an enhancement for aviation safety, while the Senate bill would cut $15.5 million. The House bill calls for a $3.5 million decrease of the Nationwide Differential GPS (NDGPS) program, a terrestrial augmentation, but the Senate bill fully funds it. To view all GPS funding bills moving through Congress, visit <http://www.pnt.gov/policy/legislation/funding/2012.shtml>.

#### GPS funding unpopular—budget requests

Hasson, 9

(Judi Hasson, journalist, March 18, 2009, Fierce Government IT, “Obama kills funding for GPS backup”, http://www.fiercegovernmentit.com/story/obama-kills-funding-gps-backup/2009-03-18)

President Obama's proposed 2010 budget cuts out funding for a backup to the Global Positioning System. The money had been part of the Department of Homeland Security budget to fund the Long Range Navigation System, or Loran-C, a terrestrial navigation system the Coast Guard operates. Terminating the system would save the government $36 million in fiscal 2010 and $190 million during a five-year period, according to the budget analysis. But critics say the backup is an essential part of the nation's basic infrastructure, and far more than just a directional tool for motorists to avoid getting lost. DHS spokesman Larry Orluskie described Loran-C as an "an antiquated navigation system" no longer required by the armed forces, the transportation sector or the nation's security interests."

### HSR Unpopular

#### HSR controversial—cost

LATimes 6/29

"Congress passes transporation bill, halts student loan rate hike," Richard Simon 6/29/12 [www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-congress-passes-transportation-bill-halts-student-loan-rate-hike-20120629,0,7176382.story](http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-congress-passes-transportation-bill-halts-student-loan-rate-hike-20120629,0,7176382.story) AD 6/29/12

Separately, the House approved an amendment to an annual spending bill that would prevent federal transportation funds from being spent in the next fiscal year for California’s controversial high-speed rail project. The amendment was sponsored by Rep. Jeff Denham (R-Atwater), who cited the project’s ballooning costs. Three California Democrats - Jim Costa of Fresno, Zoe Lofgren of San Jose and Laura Richardson of Long Beach – issued a statement calling the amendment an "example of how thoughtless partisanship would hurt all of California.’’

#### Republicans oppose HSR

**Ellis, 12**

(BY JOHN ELLIS, The Fresno Bee, Monday, Apr 30 2012 05:00 PM, For Valley GOP candidates, high-speed rail is top enemy. http://www.bakersfieldcalifornian.com/special-sections/rail/x1942474111/For-Valley-GOP-candidates-high-speed-rail-is-top-enemy)

For Republican[s] candidates this election season, high-speed rail is Enemy No. 1 -- or had better be. And that's putting some Republicans who once supported the idea in an uncomfortable spot. Take Republican Assembly hopeful Jim Patterson, for example. On Bullard Avenue, just west of Blackstone, a sign for Patterson's 23rd Assembly District campaign proclaims: "Stop the High Speed Rail Boondoggle." But a Republican opponent, Fresno attorney David DeFrank, points out that in the 1990s when Patterson was Fresno's mayor he spoke glowingly of the project. That, Patterson responded, was a different proposal that was to be routed along Highway 99 and paid for with private dollars. Welcome to the 2012 political campaign, where the state's proposed high-speed rail project has become one of the hottest campaign issues for Republicans from city council right up to Congress. "High-speed rail is a good [issue] for Republicans," said Los Angeles-based political analyst Allan Hoffenblum, a longtime Republican strategist and author of the California Target Book, which tracks the state's elections. It is one of those black-and-white proposals, he said, where a Republican can draw a clear distinction with their Democratic Party opponent. Many Democrats -- though not all -- have supported the bullet train plan. Fresno Democrat Jim Costa, for instance, has been a driving force in the project dating back to his days in the Legislature. He's seeking re-election to Congress in the newly created 16th Congressional District. John Hernandez, a Fresno Democrat running in the 21st Congressional District, has made high-speed rail one of his campaign centerpieces. But for Republican hopefuls in the June 5 primary election, being 100 percent against the train has become a litmus test of sorts. Already, two of Costa's three Republican opponents have highlighted their opposition to the high-speed rail project on their campaign websites. In Kern County, discontent with the project has been expressed fairly uniformly by local governments. The city councils of Bakersfield, Wasco and Taft have voted to oppose it, as has the county Board of Supervisors. Meanwhile, despite the project's potential for job creation, Kern's delegation in Sacramento has generally spoken against high-speed rail. Assemblywoman Shannon Grove, R-Bakersfield, has co-sponsored a measure to put the bullet train proposal back before voters for an up or down vote. At least one Fresno County supervisorial candidate, Larry Fortune, and one Fresno City Council candidate, Steve Brandau -- both Republicans seeking nonpartisan offices -- have cited opposition to high-speed rail in their campaign material. The most heated exchanges so far seem to be where Republicans are facing other Republicans in partisan races. In the 23rd Assembly District, for instance, the high-speed rail war of words isn't limited to Patterson and DeFrank. Patterson points to a January letter written by Clovis City Councilman Bob Whalen -- who is also seeking the seat -- that urged people to listen to all sides of the high-speed rail argument before reaching a conclusion. Whalen's letter doesn't say he supports the plan. It says, in part, "if you are already a 'no,' don't become an entrenched 'no' (no, regardless of benefit). If you are a 'yes,' don't become an entrenched 'yes' (yes, regardless of the cost)." Patterson said Whalen needs to be unequivocally against the project. "If there's anybody who's been the last person to figure out the boondoggle, I think it's Bob," Patterson said. "He ought to have come out against it long ago." Whalen said he is opposed -- now. He waited for the project's business plan to be released before making his decision. That, he said, was the point of his letter -- wait until all the facts were known. Patterson has done his own about-face. In early 1996, when he was mayor, Patterson said: "If the state is serious about putting high-speed rail along the corridor, support is guaranteed. This is one of the singular matters I've dealt with that's had widespread support." At the time, however, the project was pegged at $15 billion and was a much different project, Patterson said. "By 2000, I was opposed to it and haven't changed my mind since," he said. "The question is, can you recognize a boondoggle when you see it?" It's a similar issue in the 5th Assembly District, where Calaveras County businessman Rico Oller has criticized Madera County Supervisor Frank Bigelow for voting in support of high-speed rail on four different occasions. Bigelow said his view -- and that of his fellow Madera County supervisors -- changed over time as they learned more about the high-speed rail plan, and as the project itself changed. Though the supervisors -- including Bigelow -- initially supported the project, earlier this year they went on record in opposition. "As any good leader would do, you explore all the options," Bigelow said. Jon Fleischman, publisher of the FlashReport, a widely read conservative blog site, said it isn't necessarily an unforgivable sin to change your mind over time on a high-profile issue such as high-speed rail. "You can always flip," he said. "You just can't flip-flop."

#### High Speed Rail causes political controversy

New York Times, Dec 2011

(<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/h/high_speed_rail_projects/index.html>)

While high-speed trains have been zooming commuters across the continents of Europe and Asia for decades, the United States has yet to embrace the idea of the bullet train. [President Obama](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/o/barack_obama/index.html?scp=1-spot&sq=president%20obama&st=cse), in his 2011 State of the Union speech, called for a high-speed rail system over the next 25 years. However, Mr. Obama’s proposal to spend $53 billion on high-speed rail over the next six years, part of his budget deal in April, hit a roadblock when Congressional Republicans [eliminated money for that plan](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/04/13/us/politics/13rail.html) for the year. The year before, newly elected Republican governors in Florida, Ohio and Wisconsin turned down federal money their Democratic predecessors had won for new rail routes, lest their states have to cover most of the costs for trains that would draw few riders. The cuts will not halt the rail program since unspent money remains that can be used on new projects. But they leave the future of high-speed rail in the United States unclear. So far roughly $10 billion has been approved for high-speed rail, but it has been spread to dozens of projects around the country. If Congress does not approve more money, the net result of all that spending may possibly be better regular train service in many areas, and a small down payment on one bullet train, in California. California plans to build a 520-mile [high-speed rail line from Los Angeles to San Francisco](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/27/us/california-rail-project-advances-amid-cries-of-boondoggle.html?pagewanted=1&sq=high-speed%20rail&st=cse&scp=2&adxnnlx=1322515110-z6inix6eFOKxhtL9FWbBaw). And they are doing it in the face of what might seem like insurmountable political and fiscal obstacles. A state report in November 2011 projected the cost of the bullet train tripling to $98 billion for a project that would not be finished until 2033.

#### Republicans Dislike spending on public transportation especially high-speed rail

Sledge 12

(Matt, Huffington Post reporter, “Gop Candidates’ Transportation Infrastructure Talk Praises Tolls But Ignores Jobs”, 1/4/12, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/01/04/gop-candidates-transportation-infrastructure-jobs\_n\_1184314.html Accessed:6/25/12

When forced to pick between increasing funding for public transportation or interstates, the Reason poll found, 40 percent of Democrats would go with the former. Only 18 percent of GOP-backers favored public transportation over roads. On high-speed rail, which has become a favorite Republican example of a stimulus boondoggle, GOP voters are very much opposed to government support for the emerging transportation option. Only 21 percent of Republicans support government backing for bullet trains, as opposed to 47 percent of Democrats. So Romney was probably on firm ground on Monday when he told a crowd in Iowa, according to Transportation Nation, that "Amtrak ought to stand on its own feet or its own wheels or whatever you'd say."

#### Republicans hate funding for high speed rail-prohibited California from receiving funds for it

SF Gate 2/3/12

(San Francisco Gate, home of San Fran Chronicle, “Republicans prohibit funding for high speed rail,” 2/3/12, http://blog.sfgate.com/nov05election/2012/02/03/republicans-prohibit-funding-for-high-speed-rail/ Accessed:6/25/12)

House Republicans late Thursday night adopted an amendment that would prohibit California from receiving any high speed rail money in a huge five-year transportation bill headed to the House floor next week. The $270 billion bill also eliminates bicycle and pedestrian programs and detaches urban mass transit funding from its traditional revenue source. The underlying bill did not include any high speed rail funding to begin with, and indeed would cut Amtrak by 25 percent, so the prohibition serves mainly as a stick in the eye to California’s plan for bullet trains. The action is part of a [continuing effort](http://blog.sfgate.com/nov05election/2011/11/17/house-gop-kills-high-speed-rail-funding/) by Republicans to kill the entire project, which was a major element of President Obama’s 2009 stimulus. California’s $100 billion plan for bullet trains running from San Francisco to San Diego already has the stimulus money in hand to get started, but future federal funding on which the project depends is very much at risk if House Republicans maintain control of the chamber, not to mention take the White House. The high speed rail prohibition came as an amendment, approved 31-22, by Rep. Jeff Dunham, R-Turlock, who said he wanted to make sure that all transportation funds for California to go to highways.

### Hydrogen Cars – Public Supports

#### General public support hydrogen filling initiatives, including republicans

**Max, 12**

([National poll shows Americans support carbon emissions regulations](http://www.hydrogenfuelnews.com/national-poll-shows-americans-support-carbon-emissions-regulations/853374/) By [John Max](http://www.hydrogenfuelnews.com/author/john/) – April 30, 2012 Posted in: [Alternative Energy](http://www.hydrogenfuelnews.com/category/alternative-energy-2/), [Environmental](http://www.hydrogenfuelnews.com/category/environmental/), [Political](http://www.hydrogenfuelnews.com/category/political/), [Research](http://www.hydrogenfuelnews.com/category/research/), [United States](http://www.hydrogenfuelnews.com/category/united-states/) http://www.hydrogenfuelnews.com/national-poll-shows-americans-support-carbon-emissions-regulations/853374/)

According to the poll, 75% of Americans support regulating carbon emissions. A significant portion of these people claimed to be Republicans. The poll notes that 63% of Americans support the establishment of an international initiative to reduce greenhouse emissions by 90% by 2050, well beyond the standards set up by most countries. The majority of participants claimed that environmental protection and economic growth were major factors in supporting alternative energy and emissions regulations.

.

### Mass Transit unpopular with GOP

#### Republicans oppose mass transit

**Denvir, June 21st**

(Daniel Denvir, 6/21, staff writer for Philedelphia City Paper and Salon, guardian.co.uk, Thursday 21 June 2012 16.31 EDT “Public transportation: 'Don't like the cuts? Take a hike'”)

Americans have since the second world war built an entire way of life around the automobile. It turns out, however, that our faith was an unsteady one and, in the face of high gas prices and young people's increasing [preference for urban living](http://www.good.is/post/young-people-are-driving-less-and-not-just-because-they-re-broke/), we are heading back to subways, trains, buses and trolleys in droves. In the first quarter of this year, we took an additional 125.7m trips on mass transit compared with the same time period last year – an increase of 5%. Yet, Republican-led austerity is pushing public transit, like most everything public, into severe fiscal and physical crisis. All at the very moment when we want and need it the most. Nationwide, 80% of mass transit systems either did move to boost fares and cut services or considered doing so in 2010, [according to the most recent report from the American Public Transportation Association](http://www.apta.com/mediacenter/pressreleases/2011/Pages/110817_ServiceCut_Survey.aspx). Fare hikes and service cuts may be coming to Philadelphia, home to the nation's sixth largest transit system – and the subject of a [report I wrote for Thursday's City Paper](http://www.citypaper.net/cover_story/2012-06-21-why-septa-is-heading-for-a-crash.html). The Southeastern [Pennsylvania](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/pennsylvania)Transportation Authority (SEPTA) projects a $36m deficit beginning in July 2013 and already lacks the funds necessary to fix crumbling, century-old bridges and electrical equipment. [Boston's MBTA proposed](http://articles.boston.com/2012-06-20/metro/32320100_1_state-surplus-bus-agencies-service-cuts) "massive fare increases and widespread cuts" to close a $160m deficit in January. On Tuesday, the Massachusetts legislature came through with last-minute funding. The one-year fix, however, ensures that the fiscal crisis will soon return. Political and popular will, however, can still make big projects happens. In Los Angeles, local sales tax hikes have funded an impressive [expansion of light-rail lines](http://www.sacbee.com/2012/05/27/4519118/its-costly-but-los-angeles-is.html). But the Metropolitan Transit Authority has also [cut more than 650,000 hours of bus service in recent years](http://articles.latimes.com/2012/apr/24/local/la-me-mta-civil-rights-20120424), a major hardship for the working poor [who depend on buses](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/04/us/04bus.html?_r=1&pagewanted=all) to commute across the sprawling and car-dominated metropolis. [The Bus Riders Union accused the agency](http://www.thestrategycenter.org/blog/2012/04/24/updated-fta-ruling-out-la-metro-civil-rights-violations-were-calling-obama-intervene) of having "knowingly discriminated against bus riders of color"; the Federal Transit Administration, which undertook a civil rights investigation, called the cuts "disturbing". Shifting to mass transit is not only critical to staving off an ecological crisis, it is also key to getting out of our economic one: the [expansion of rail and bus lines drives development](http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/economic_impact_of_public_transportation_investment.pdf), creating jobs while making it easier for the rest of us to get to our existing ones. The reverse is also true. The dismantling of mass transit has, like cuts to other public services, erected a massive roadblock on the path to economic recovery: 706,000 public sector jobs have been eliminated since the stimulus topped out in April 2009, according to a [Wednesday report in the New York Times](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/20/business/public-workers-face-continued-layoffs-and-recovery-is-hurt.html?pagewanted=all). While the private sector adds jobs, public sector austerity is driving the American economy off the tracks. Pittsburgh, which is set to cut about half of its bus lines, is a case in point. DialAmerica delayed plans to open a new 150-person call center in the city because the company, [according to a recent report in the Wall Street Journal](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304791704577418643668145680.html), says they are concerned that employees wouldn't be able to get to work. Pennsylvania Republican Governor Tom Corbett, who signed Grover Norquist's tax pledge during his 2010 campaign, has refused calls from labor and business leaders to raise revenue to deal with the state's infrastructure needs – estimated by his own transportation commission to be $3.5bn in necessary work. When I asked what the governor planned to do about the crisis in Philadelphia, I was told that we were on our own. "It is incumbent upon SEPTA," PennDOT spokeswoman Erin Waters told City Paper, "to meet operational and safety requirements." There was a time when business-minded conservatives understood that, ultimately, government did serve some purpose – if only to create an environment favorable to business. Members of both parties have for decades supported basic funding of the nation's trains and buses. But Corbett's counterparts in Washington now deliver that same heady combination of obliviousness and hostility. The derision of mass transit as a socialist import of European origin, which happens to be perceived also as a welfare subsidy for the black and urban poor, has now seized the entire Republican body politic. Most bizarrely, Tea Party activists around the country have attacked everything from bike lanes to high-speed trains as part of a [United Nations conspiracy to create a "one-world order"](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/04/us/activists-fight-green-projects-seeing-un-plot.html?pagewanted=all). "Federal transportation and infrastructure policy has traditionally been an area of strong bipartisan agreement," Aaron Naparstek, a Loeb Fellow at Harvard University's Graduate School of Design and founder of[Streetsblog.org](http://www.salon.com/2012/02/13/the_tea_partys_war_on_mass_transit/www.streetsblog.org) told [Salon](http://www.salon.com/2012/02/13/the_tea_partys_war_on_mass_transit/): "Now, it seems, [Republicans](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/republicans) want to turn cities into a part of the culture wars. Now it's abortion, gay marriage and subways." Earlier this year, House Republicans proposed eliminating the 20% of transportation dollars dedicated to mass transit since Ronald Reagan first signed it into law in 1982. In response, mass transit advocates [mobilized suburban Republicans](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0412/75221.html), alongside big business, to oppose the move: mass transit serves as important connective tissue in the [large metropolitan economies that drive the economy](http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/02/24/usa-states-cities-idUSN241581220110224) on a regional and national level. Yet, long-term transit funding is still uncertain, as Republicans now insist that a new transportation bill include an unrelated amendment designed to fast-track approval for the controversial Keystone XL pipeline – together with a move that will save few dollars but sends a potent message to the base: an amendment to bar the use of federal dollars for bike lanes. The last six-year transportation bill expired three years ago, and funding has, since then, been dolled out in three- and six-month increments. Meanwhile, the financial titans who brought us to edge of abyss are profiting from cash-strapped transit agencies, which are paying out millions of dollars every year to Wall Street, thanks to toxic derivatives. In a little-discussed but critical moment of the pre-crash deregulatory fever, transit agencies – along with school districts and city governments – agreed to esoteric "interest-rate swaps" with banks in order to protect against high interest rates on bond payments. The theory was that banks would get paid at a fixed rate, in exchange for them paying transit agencies at the variable rate. But after the financial system went into crisis, the Federal Reserve drove interest rates to rock-bottom levels. As a result, transit agencies and other public entities are now stuck owing billions in interest payments to the very same banks taxpayers had just bailed out. [A recent study by the ReFund Transit Coalition found (pdf)](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=5&ved=0CFkQFjAE&url=http://refundtransit.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/STRAT_TransitSWAPS.pdf&ei=VUHjT-u1EKe_0AGD8-3TAw&usg=AFQjCNHhFBZ-gJTcVAJlZ8EdPJ6ei0RIOw&sig2=Eo2DZZ7vWe0ng31hGTCiIA) that in the 12 regions surveyed – including New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, San Francisco and Los Angeles – agencies lose more than $529m each year to Wall Street banks. Transit riders and workers will have to organize throughout American cities and suburbs if there is to be any hope – not only of saving mass transit, but of undertaking the large-scale expansion we need for our economic and ecological well-being. Last week, the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) and Good Jobs First announced plans to do just that, creating [Americans for Transit](https://www.facebook.com/AmericansForTransit) to fight cuts and help organize rider groups nationwide. "Transit is a major social justice issue of our day," says ATU International president Larry Hanley. "Ridership is the highest in decades, but riders have suffered the worst wave of fare hikes and service cuts in post-war history."

#### Mass transit policies are unpopular – GOP will block due to electoral demographics

Freemark ‘11

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “Understanding the Republican Party’s Reluctance to Invest in Transit Infrastructure”

January 25th, 2011 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/01/25/understanding-the-republican-partys-reluctance-to-invest-in-transit-infrastructure/)

Highway funding, on the other hand, has remained relatively stable throughout, and that’s no surprise, either: The middle 50% of congressional districts, representing about half of the American population, features populations that live in neighborhoods of low to moderate densities, fully reliant on cars to get around. It is only in the densest sections of the country that transit (or affordable housing, for instance) is even an issue — which is why it appears to be mostly of concern to the Democratic Party. Republicans in the House for the most part do not have to answer to voters who are interested in improved public transportation. This situation, of course, should be of significant concern to those who would advocate for better transit. To put matters simply, few House Republicans have any electoral reason to promote such projects, and thus, for the most part they don’t. But that produces a self-reinforcing loop; noting the lack of GOP support for urban needs, city voters push further towards the Democrats. And sensing that the Democratic Party is a collection of urbanites, those from elsewhere push away. It’s hard to know how to reverse this problem.

#### Public transit legislation drains capital – angers GOP

Freemark ‘10

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “Growing Conservative Strength Puts Transit Improvements in Doubt” – December 1st, 2010 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2010/12/01/growing-conservative-strength-puts-transit-improvements-in-doubt/)

The next few years are likely to be difficult for advocates of public transportation because of increased hostility to government investment. 1987, 1991, 1995, 1998, and 2005 share a significant feature: In each of those years, members of Congress were able to come together to pass a multi-year bill that codified how the U.S. government was to collect revenues for and allocate expenditures on transportation. Not coincidentally, in each of those years, one political party controlled both the House and Senate. In the 112th Congress, set to enter office in just one month, Democrats will run the Senate and Republicans the House. This split control will make passing any legislation difficult. Unlike in those aforementioned years, there is little chance that this group of legislators will be able to pass a multi-year transportation bill either in 2011 or 2012. These circumstances, combined with increasingly strident conservative rhetoric about the need to reduce government expenditures, may fundamentally challenge the advances the Obama Administration and the Democratic Congress have been able to make over the past two years in expanding the nation’s intercity rail network, promoting a vision for livable communities, and reinforcing funding for urban transit. Continuing those efforts would require identifying sources of increased revenue and a steadfast commitment to reducing the role of the automobile in American society. But there is little support for increased taxes from any side of the political table and there is a fundamental aversion from the mainstream Republican Party to the investments that have defined the government’s recent transportation strategy. Meanwhile, declining power of the purse resulting from a fuel tax last increased in 1993 means that the existing situation is unacceptable, at least if there is any sense that something must be done to expand investment in transportation infrastructure. Gridlock — and myopic thinking about how to improve mobility in the United States — will ensue.

### NIB—Unpopular

#### Congress hates National Infrastructure Bank, would take huge political capital to pass

Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Press Release 11,

(“NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE BANK WOULD CREATE MORE RED TAPE & FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY,” October 12, 2011, http://transportation.house.gov/news/PRArticle.aspx?NewsID=1421)

“We must use every responsible mechanism possible to move projects and expand our capacity to finance infrastructure maintenance and improvements, but a National Infrastructure Bank is dead on arrival in Congress,” said U.S. Rep. John L. Mica (R-FL), Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. “There are several reasons for this. One is that we do not need to create more federal bureaucracy. In fact, with over 100 separate federal surface transportation programs, we need less bureaucracy. “The federal government also has existing financing programs that serve the same purpose as a National Infrastructure Bank, such as TIFIA, RRIF and others, that we can improve and strengthen. “Another reason a national bank is DOA is because there is already such a bank structure in place at the state level. Thirty-three state infrastructure banks already exist, and we can ensure financing and build upon this foundation without creating a new level of federal bureaucracy. “If the Administration’s goal is to get people to work immediately, a National Infrastructure Bank that will require more than a year to create and $270 million to run is not the answer. That is funding that should be used for infrastructure, but would instead be used to create more red tape. “Unfortunately, the Administration still hasn’t learned that ‘shovel ready’ has become a national joke. Yesterday, the President announced he would expedite 14 infrastructure projects, but this plan only pushes these projects to the front of the line with current red tape and rules, while it pushes back or stalls hundreds of other projects pending federal approval. We must expedite the review process for all projects, not just a handful.”

#### NIB unpopular in Congress

Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Press Release 11

(“NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE BANK WOULD CREATE MORE RED TAPE & FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY,” October 12, 2011, http://transportation.house.gov/news/PRArticle.aspx?NewsID=1421)

“I, for one, do not support setting up a new bureaucracy in Washington where political appointees would decide which transportation projects are the most worthy to receive a Federal loan,” said U.S. Rep. John J. Duncan, Jr. (R-TN), Chairman of the Highways and Transit Subcommittee. “That is why Congress already established the State Infrastructure Bank program. Current law allows a state to use their Federal-aid funding to capitalize a State Infrastructure Bank and provide loans and loan guarantees to appropriate transportation projects that the state deems most important. “The Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act program, or TIFIA, was established in 1998 to provide loans and loan guarantees to surface transportation projects. In fact, the TIFIA program is so popular it received 14 times the amount of project funding requests in FY11 than the program has available to distribute. “Why not give these established programs more funding in order for them to reach their full potential? “This proposal is simply just another distraction as Congress pushes for a long-term surface transportation reauthorization bill. The Administration should be focused on helping Congress pass this much overdue legislation and give the states some long-term funding certainty that a National Infrastructure Bank would most certainly not accomplish.”

#### NIB lacks necessary bipartisan support necessary to pass

Orski 11

(Ken, writer for newgeography.com, “INFRASTRUCTURE BANK: LOSING FAVOR WITH THE WHITE HOUSE?” August 30, 2010, http://www.newgeography.com/content/002408-infrastructure-bank-losing-favor-with-white-house)

President Obama was expected to include the infrastructure bank among his recommended stimulus measures when he lays out his new job-creation plan before the congressional deficit reduction committee in early September. But lately, he seems to have put the idea on the back burner and turned his attention to more traditional "shovel-ready" highway investments using existing financing programs. His advisers may have concluded that the Bank will do little to stimulate immediate job creation--- and that the proposal will find little support among congressional Democrats and Republicans alike. If so, check off the Infrastructure Bank as an idea whose time had come and gone.

#### NIB faces bipartisan dissent in Congress

Orski 11

(Ken, writer for newgeography.com, “INFRASTRUCTURE BANK: LOSING FAVOR WITH THE WHITE HOUSE?” August 30, 2010, http://www.newgeography.com/content/002408-infrastructure-bank-losing-favor-with-white-house)

But today, the idea is on life support. Neither the Senate nor the House have seen fit to include the Bank in their proposed transportation bills. Congressional Democrats and Republicans alike are in agreement that decision making control over major federal investments should not be ceded to a group of "unelected bureaucrats." Rather than creating a new federal bureaucracy, they think the focus should be placed on expanding federal credit assistance tools already in place, such as the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) and the Railroad Rehabilitation & Improvement Financing Program (RRIF). There are other reasons for congressional skepticism. House Republicans are suspicious that the Obama-proposed Bank is nothing more than a vehicle for more stimulus spending, disguised as "capital investment." They want the Administration to be more specific about its proposal: how the Bank would be funded, what kind of investments it would fund and how the $30 billion capital would be repaid. "If this is more of the same stimulus spending, we won’t support it," Kevin Smith, spokesman for House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) has been quoted as saying. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee chairman John Mica (R-FL) thinks state-level infrastructure banks would be a more appropriate means of financing major transportation projects at the state and local level. Decentralized infrastructure financing would "keep the federal financing bureaucracy at a minimum and maximize states’ financial capabilities," according to the House transportation reauthorization proposal. Senate Democrats, while not necessarily opposed to another fiscal stimulus, want quick results. They fear that a centralized Infrastructure Bank, with its complex governance structure and layers of bureaucratic conditions, requirements and approvals would be far too slow and cumbersome to be an effective job generator. One or two years could pass before large-scale projects appropriate for Bank financing would get evaluated, selected, approved and under construction, one Senate aide told us. What is more, there is a lack of agreement on how the proposed Infrastructure Bank should function. The Administration wants a mechanism that would serve several different purposes. In the words of Undersecretary for Transportation Policy Roy Kienitz who testified at a September 21, 2010 hearing of the Senate Banking Committee, "We need a financing institution that can provide a range of financing options— grants for projects that by their nature cannot generate revenue, and loans and loan guarantees for projects that can pay for their construction costs out of a revenue stream. In short, we need the Infrastructure Bank that the President has proposed." But, "banks don’t give out grants, they give out loans. There is already a mechanism for giving out federal transportation grants — it’s called the highway bill," countered Sen. James Inhofe (R-OK), ranking member of the Senate Environment and Public Works (EPW) Committee. If the proposed entity is to be a true bank – as proposed in a recent bill sponsored by Senators John Kerry (D-MA) and Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX) and endorsed by the AFL-CIO and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce– its scope would be confined to projects that can repay interest and principal on their loans with a dedicated stream of revenue — in other words, the Bank could finance only income-generating facilities such as toll roads and bridges. By all estimates, such projects will constitute only a small fraction of the overall inventory of transportation improvements needed to be financed in the years ahead, the bulk of which will be reconstruction of existing toll-free Interstate highways. Hence, a true Infrastructure Bank would be of limited help in creating jobs and reviving the economy, critics argue. "A national infrastructure bank must garner broad bipartisan support to move forward," says Michael Likosky, Director of NYU's Center on Law & Public Finance and author of a recent book, Obama's Bank:Financing a Durable New Deal. "This means no grants, a multi-sector reach and a realistic idea of what projects will benefit straight away."

### NIB—Bipart

#### NIB has bipartisan support

Compton 11

(Matt, Deputy Director of Online Content for the Office of Digital Strategy, “Five Facts About a National Infrastructure Bank”, November 3rd, 2011, http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2011/11/03/five-facts-about-national-infrastructure-bank)

Yesterday, with the Key Bridge, which connects Washington, DC with Arlington, Virginia, as a backdrop, President Obama discussed the ways that the American Jobs Act will invest in the nation's highways, airports, roads, and bridges -- and create new jobs for construction workers. Today, the Senate is set to take up one idea that the President touted -- the creation of a national infrastructure bank. Here's how it would work: 1) Congress would appropriate an initial $10 billion in startup money to capitalize the bank. 2) The new bank would identify transportation, energy, and water infrastructure projects that lack funding, offer a clear benefit for taxpayers, and are worth at least $100 million or $25 million for rural projects. 3) Loans made by the bank would then be matched by private sector investments or money from local governments -- so that the infrastructure bank provides half or less than half the total funding. 4) Each project would generate its own revenues to help ensure repayment of the loan. 5) Decisions would be made by a seven-person board of governors -- of whom, no more than four could be from the same political party -- and a CEO chosen by the President. One bonus fact: The legislation that would create the bank has serious bipartisan backing -- and the support of both the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the AFL-CIO

#### Both media and congress support NIB

Schweitzer, Alderman and Bayh 11

(Howard, Mark and Evan; Opinions contributors for the Washington Post. “We already have the infrastructure bank we need.” September 29, 2011, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/we-already-have-the-infrastructure-bank-we-need/2011/09/27/gIQA59TI8K\_story.html)

In the American Jobs Act, President Obama reiterated his call for a national infrastructure bank, building on bipartisan legislation introduced in March by Sens. John Kerry (D-Mass.), Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-Tex.) and Mark Warner (D-Va.). The media are awash with calls to pass legislation creating a government bank to support private-sector investment in projects that would revitalize our domestic infrastructure, which most experts agree is in disrepair

### NIB—Obama Likes

#### Obama favors jobs’ bill and National Infrastructure Bank, urging suggests

Everett & Snider 6/15

(Burgess and Adam, writers for Politico, “Scope of conference rears its head - Is it all up to Boehner? - TCC ads embolden GOP - Keystone simmers on backburner.” June 15, 2012, http://www.politico.com/morningtransportation/0612/morningtransportation164.html)

INFRASTRUCTURE RERUN: President Obama again went out on an infrastructure limb during an economic speech in Cleveland, although you may have heard some of these ideas before — and Congress certainly has. “Now is not the time to saddle American businesses with crumbling roads and bridges. Now is the time to rebuild America. So my plan would take half the money we’re no longer spending on war — let’s use it to do some nation-building here at home. Let’s put some folks to work right here at home.” The president also referred to his national infrastructure bank. “My plan sets up an independent fund to attract private dollars and issue loans for new construction projects based on two criteria: How badly are they needed and how much good will they do for the economy.”

### NIB—Obama doesn’t care

#### NIB unimportant to Obama right now—lack of interest proves

Orski 11

(Ken, writer for newgeography.com, “INFRASTRUCTURE BANK: LOSING FAVOR WITH THE WHITE HOUSE?” August 30, 2010, http://www.newgeography.com/content/002408-infrastructure-bank-losing-favor-with-white-house)

President Obama was expected to include the infrastructure bank among his recommended stimulus measures when he lays out his new job-creation plan before the congressional deficit reduction committee in early September. But lately, he seems to have put the idea on the back burner and turned his attention to more traditional "shovel-ready" highway investments using existing financing programs. His advisers may have concluded that the Bank will do little to stimulate immediate job creation--- and that the proposal will find little support among congressional Democrats and Republicans alike. If so, check off the Infrastructure Bank as an idea whose time had come and gone.

### NIB—GOP hates

#### Republicans reject Obama’s NIB, see it as excess spending

Orski 11

(Ken, writer for newgeography.com, “INFRASTRUCTURE BANK: LOSING FAVOR WITH THE WHITE HOUSE?” August 30, 2010, http://www.newgeography.com/content/002408-infrastructure-bank-losing-favor-with-white-house)

House Republicans are suspicious that the Obama-proposed Bank is nothing more than a vehicle for more stimulus spending, disguised as "capital investment." They want the Administration to be more specific about its proposal: how the Bank would be funded, what kind of investments it would fund and how the $30 billion capital would be repaid. "If this is more of the same stimulus spending, we won’t support it," Kevin Smith, spokesman for House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) has been quoted as saying. House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee chairman John Mica (R-FL) thinks state-level infrastructure banks would be a more appropriate means of financing major transportation projects at the state and local level.

#### Republicans dislike NIB, questioning its impact on the econ

Jaffe 10

(staffwriter for ABCnews.com, “Another Bank? President Obama Pushing National Infrastructure Bank.” September 8, 2010, http://abcnews.go.com/Business/bank-president-obama-pushing-national-infrastructure-bank/story?id=11584294#.T-z8VrVfGVo)

No sooner had Obama outlined his proposal than Rep. Eric Cantor, the House Republican Whip, accused the administration of "blindly throwing darts at the board and hoping for a bulls-eye." "Reports from across the country show that dollars intended for infrastructure improvement in the President's first stimulus are being wasted, so how will his latest be any different?" asked Cantor. "Additionally, federal infrastructure projects are typically slow to commence on the ground, meaning that this new effort will do little in the immediate future to kick start the economy."

### NIB—Americans Support

#### Americans overwhelmingly support National Infrastructure Bank, poll shows

Senate Fact Sheet 11

(“Fact Sheet: Rebuild America Jobs Act” (October 21, 2011, http://democrats.senate.gov/2011/10/21/fact-sheet-rebuild-america-jobs-act/)

CNN/ORC Poll: 72% of Americans, 54% of Republicans Support Rebuilding Our Infrastructure. According to a recent CNN/ORC Poll, 72% of Americans support “increasing federal spending to build and repair roads, bridges and schools,” while only 28% oppose. This is up from 64% from September of this year. 70% of Independents and 54% of Republicans support funding our infrastructure. [CNN/ORC Poll, 10/17/11] Rockefeller Foundation: 72% of Americans Support Infrastructure Bank. The Rockefeller Foundation infrastructure survey, conducted in February 2011, found that 72% of Americans support “Creating a National Infrastructure Bank that helps finance transportation projects that are important to the whole nation or large regions and that funds projects based on merit, not politics.” [Rockefeller Foundation, 2/14/11]

### NIB—Dems Hates

#### Dems dislike NIB, disagreement on function and time

Orski 11,

(Ken, writer for newgeography.com, “INFRASTRUCTURE BANK: LOSING FAVOR WITH THE WHITE HOUSE?” (August 30, 2010, http://www.newgeography.com/content/002408-infrastructure-bank-losing-favor-with-white-house)

Senate Democrats, while not necessarily opposed to another fiscal stimulus, want quick results. They fear that a centralized Infrastructure Bank, with its complex governance structure and layers of bureaucratic conditions, requirements and approvals would be far too slow and cumbersome to be an effective job generator. One or two years could pass before large-scale projects appropriate for Bank financing would get evaluated, selected, approved and under construction, one Senate aide told us. What is more, there is a lack of agreement on how the proposed Infrastructure Bank should function.

### NIB—Dems Love

#### Democrats strongly support NIB

Jaffe 10

(staffwriter for ABCnews.com, “Another Bank? President Obama Pushing National Infrastructure Bank.” (September 8, 2010, http://abcnews.go.com/Business/bank-president-obama-pushing-national-infrastructure-bank/story?id=11584294#.T-z8VrVfGVo)

But across the political aisle Democrats quickly threw their support behind the President's new proposal. Said Senate Banking Committee chairman Chris Dodd, "A significant investment in our ailing national infrastructure will create jobs, boost long-term economic growth, and improve safety. With a National Infrastructure Bank we could leverage state, local, and private funds to ensure our infrastructure systems are equipped to meet the demands of the 21st century." Over in the House of Representatives, Rep. Rosa DeLauro, D-CT, has proposed legislation that would place the infrastructure bank under the purview of the Treasury Department and allow it to make loans much like the World Bank currently does. "This is the kind of initiative we need to support the economy and produce long-term job growth," DeLauro said. "The National Infrastructure Bank is a concept which has garnered broad support from governors, mayors, the business and labor communities, as well as others. For such a bank to succeed, it should function as an independent entity and leverage private dollars to make objective investments in transportation, environmental, energy, and telecommunications projects of regional and national significance."

### **Port Security - Unpopular**

#### House Against Port Security- Already rejected twice

(Targeted News Service 6/8/12 http://posttrib.suntimes.com/news/13061943-418/how-they-voted.html)

PORT SECURITY GRANTS: The House rejected an amendment sponsored by Rep. Janice Hahn, D-Calif., to the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act (H.R. 5855). The amendment would have increased funding for state and local port security grants by the Federal Emergency Management Agency by $75 million. Hahn said: “This amendment will ensure that the ports receive the funding they need in order to address the lingering gaps in port security of which there are many.” An opponent, Rep. Robert B. Aderholt, R-Ala., said the amendment would eliminate funding for the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, and therefore endanger “our research capacity into pathogens that afflict animals and our food chain and, by extension, human beings.” The vote, on June 6, was 144 yeas to 273 nays. Votes: Donnelly, yea; Visclosky, nay ANTI-TERRORISM INITIATIVES: The House rejected an amendment sponsored by Rep. Brian Higgins, D-N.Y., to the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act (H.R. 5855). The amendment would have provided a $58 million increase in funding for anti-terrorism initiatives in 36 urban areas from the Federal Emergency Management Agency. Higgins said: “We should be doing everything that we can to empower these communities to protect themselves from these threats.” An opponent, Rep. Robert B. Aderholt, R-Ala., said the amendment would discourage fiscal discipline and cut investment in critical science and technology research and development programs at the Department of Homeland Security. The vote, on June 6, was 150 yeas to 266 nays.

### Port Security—Bipart

#### Port Security with Bipartisanship- Passed in House

(Marroquin 6/28/12 Staff writer at daily breeze http://www.dailybreeze.com/news/ci\_20964828/hahns-bill-addressing-security-gaps-at-seaports-approved)

A South Bay lawmaker's bill directing the Department of Homeland Security to examine security gaps in the nation's seaports was approved Thursday by the House of Representatives. House Resolution 4005, authored by Rep. Janice Hahn, D-San Pedro, also directs the DHS to prepare a plan to address security problems, including the fact that less than 3 percent of the cargo coming into ports is scanned for weapons. The measure, approved on a 411-9 vote, now goes to the U.S. Senate for consideration. While the Port of Los Angeles is not in Hahn's current 36th Congressional District, it was part of the area she represented for 10 years on the Los Angeles City Council. She is running against Rep. Laura Richardson in the new 44th Congressional District, which includes the port. "We will be able to better protect our ports and their contributions to our economy if we know where the weaknesses are and have a plan to address them. Therefore, I'm very pleased this bipartisan and common-sense piece of legislation has passed," Hahn said. - Art Marroquin

### Ports unpopular - public

#### Ports unpopular—public dislikes funding mechanism

Stein, 12

(Perry Stein, staff writer/journalist, March 14, 2012, NBC Washington, “Morning Read: O'Malley To Pitch Unpopular Gas Tax In House And Senate”, http://www.nbcwashington.com/blogs/first-read-dmv/Morning-Read-OMalley-To-Pitch-Unpopular-Gas-Tax-In-House-And-Senate-142611796.html)

Gov. Martin O’Malley will appear in front of House and Senate committees today to make a personal pitch for his widely unpopular proposal to increase gas tax. O’Malley knows that the gas tax won’t be an easy sell, according to The Baltimore Sun. With gas prices on the rise, many people don’t see why more gas taxes are needed and are wary of O’Malley increasing the gas tax when his budget also calls for increased income taxes. Maryland needs to maintain decent roads and transportation infrastructure or its businesses and citizens suffer. From the Port of Baltimore to Baltimore-Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport and the highways, tunnels, bridges and rail networks, the state's economy depends on maintaining and expanding these vital connections to the rest of the country and the world.

#### Waterways unpopular—taxpayers see no need and empirically have required large efforts by supporters

Roode, May 2012

(Benjamin Roode, staff writer, May 2012, PE Magazine, “Infrastructure: How We Got Here”, http://www.nspe.org/PEmagazine/12/pe\_0512\_How.html)

The country's roads, sewers, and dams are the best designed and best performing in the world. That's one of the main reasons they're crumbling, infrastructure experts say. When taxpayers drive the same roads day-in and day-out, turn on the faucet for automatic water, and flip a switch for light, it gets easier to take for granted the infrastructure making those amenities possible. Why spend tax money when there's no problem apparent to a public that lacks infrastructure engineering knowledge and perspective? Other major projects—the Golden Gate Bridge, New Deal dam projects, and various major metropolitan water systems—secured public funding as the need for such construction was presented and justified to the public, whether for transportation, power, or health and safety reasons. Money to upgrade or repair such systems is sometimes hard to come by, however, especially when neither voters nor the politicians they elect recognize the limits of infrastructure nor will commit to long-term solutions. Why spend public money on a system that currently works, voters ask.

### Ports popular - Congress

#### Ports popular—bipartisan caucus and acts prove

Abbott, 12—editor of AAPA Seaports

(Paul Scott Abbott, editor of AAPA Seaports, April 6, 2012, American Journal of Transportation, “Port leaders push support for infrastructure funding”, http://ajot.com/article\_SpecialFeatures.asp?ArticleId=14237)

Mica-sponsored House transportation reauthorization measure H.R. 7 calls for investing all available resources in the $7 billion Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in harbor projects, while a similar objective is sought by H.R. 104, the Realize America’s Maritime Promise (RAMP) Act, which, since its January 2011 introduction by U.S. Rep. Dr. Charles W. Boustany Jr., R-La., has gained a total of 187 co-sponsors. Two of the RAMP Act’s co-sponsors, U.S. Rep. Janice Hahn, D-Calif., and U.S. Rep. Ted Poe, R-Texas, launched March 20 business sessions by explaining that they co-founded the bipartisan Congressional Ports Opportunity, Renewal, Trade and Security (PORTS) Caucus in October to help underscore the significance of funding for U.S. ports, which support 13.3 mil- lion jobs and account for $3.15 trillion in annual economic activity.

#### Ports and waterways popular—House and Senate budget appropriations

Reuters, 12

(Reuters, Press Release, April 25, 2012, “Realize America's Maritime Promise, the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund Coalition Statement on Passage of H. Con. Res. 112, the House FY-2013 Budget Resolution”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/05/idUS193512+05-Apr-2012+PRN20120405)

WASHINGTON, April 5, 2012 /PRNewswire-USNewswire/ -- Last week, the House of Representatives passed a Fiscal Year 2013 budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 112). Unlike the past several years, this year's budget debate included some discussion of the longstanding problem of underfunded harbor maintenance. This recognition of the harbor maintenance issue by the House Budget Committee is a positive small step forward. RAMP believes that enactment of H.R.104, the RAMP Act, or its Senate companion bill, S.412, the Harbor Maintenance Act, is essential to address this growing national problem. The text of H. Con. Res. 112 does not include any specific language related to the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF). The Budget Committee report on this legislation includes the following text: "In addition, the budget acknowledges the importance of maintaining our ports and waterways to encourage commercial deep-draft navigation and economic competitiveness. In fiscal year 2012, a total of $898 million was appropriated from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund [HMTF], an increase of $109 million over the administration's request. However, there continues to be a large balance in the fund and outstanding harbor maintenance needs." The H. Con. Res. 112 report language does not provide any authority or direction to the House Appropriations Committee to increase annual funding levels for harbor maintenance.

### Ports Unpopular - Congress

#### Waterways unpopular—federal government doesn’t want responsibility of funding

Stern, 12—analyst in natural resources policy

(Charles V. Stern, Analyst in Natural Resources Policy, April 12, 2012, Congressional Research Service, “Inland Waterways: Recent Proposals and Issues for Congress”, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41430.pdf)

Previously the Bush and Obama administrations have recommended replacing the fuel tax with one or more user fees that would increase revenues beyond their current baseline. However, Congress and industry interests have rejected these proposals. In 2010, the Inland Waterways Users Board (IWUB), a federal advisory committee advising the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on inland waterways, endorsed an alternative proposal that is supported by many barge industry interests. The proposal would increase the fuel tax by $0.06-$0.08 per gallon, but would also require that the federal government handle the full cost for some projects that are currently cost- shared. The Obama Administration generally opposes this approach, and has previously submitted multiple proposals to increase trust fund revenues with new user fees, in addition to the fuel tax. Most recently, the Administration submitted, in its plan to the Joint Committee on Deficit Reduction, a proposal for new waterway user fees in 2011, and included new revenues from an unspecified new inland waterways fee in its FY2013 budget request. To date, none of these changes have been enacted. The user industry (including the barge industry and agricultural groups) argues that changes are necessary to shore up the trust fund, improve deteriorating inland waterway infrastructure, and distribute costs more equitably among those who benefit from the system (e.g., more funding by federal taxpayers for dams). They also note that waterways support jobs and are a vital component of the nation’s transportation mix. The Obama Administration generally agrees that major changes are needed to meet infrastructure needs, but argues against increased costs for the federal government. Some groups also argue that an increased share of waterway costs should be borne by users (i.e., a decreased share for the federal government), and have suggested that operations and maintenance costs (currently a 100% federal cost) should also be a user responsibility.

#### Waterway funding contentious—funding mechanism flaws and proposal rejections prove

Committee on Appropriations, 11

(Committee on Appropriations, September 7, 2011, “ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012”, http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/cpquery/?&sid=cp112ncvda&r\_n=sr075.112&dbname=cp112&&sel=TOC\_28798&)

The previous administration notified this Committee when they submitted the fiscal year 2008 budget (February 2007) that there was a looming problem with the amount of revenues available in the Inland Waterways Trust Fund and that a legislative proposal would be forthcoming to address the situation. That legislative proposal was not presented to Congress until April 2008. In the fiscal year 2009 budget (February 2008) the previous administration proposed a lockage user fee to replace the current fuel tax as a mechanism to enhance revenues in the trust fund. This lockage fee was roundly criticized as being developed without any input from navigation users and was rejected by Congress. Unfortunately the administration assumed these revenues as a part of their fiscal year 2009 budget request which overstated the amount of funding available for cost sharing with these projects. Budgeted items could not be funded without these assumed revenues leading to curtailment of the work planned for fiscal year 2009. For fiscal year 2010-2012, the current administration did not make that assumption. Rather they aligned their budget request to account for expected revenues to be generated by the trust fund in the given budget year. This severely curtailed the funding available for modernization of the system. However, the budget request has still discussed the lockage fee proposal as a way to enhance revenues in the trust fund. In fiscal year 2010 this Committee recommended that waterway users, the Corps and the appropriate authorizing committees should work together to find a solution to this funding issue. A working group consisting of a combination of Corps of Engineers navigation, economics and engineering experts and Inland Waterways User Board members from industry, worked diligently for over a year to develop a 20-year capital investment strategy for the Inland Waterways System. The proposal they developed not only enhanced revenues in the trust fund, but also provided a schedule to prioritize the work over a 20-year period. The plan was submitted to the Congress and the administration last year. In December 2010, the administration provided their views on the capital investment strategy. While the administration noted the efforts of the working group, it found fault with virtually every facet of the strategy. While the Committee recognizes that implementation of some of the proposals in the overall strategy would have been problematic, the Committee believes that the strategy could have been further modified to develop a plan that was acceptable to all parties. Unfortunately, the overall tone of the administration response was dismissive of the working group's efforts. This is especially disappointing since a number of members of the working group were employees of the administration. The administration's response to the strategy further decided to bring in extraneous issues to the Trust Fund discussion concerning operation and maintenance costs. Those issues may need to be addressed, but not in the scope of determining an investment strategy to recapitalize the Inland Waterways System.

#### Ports unpopular—legislation empirically avoided by Obama administration

Committee on Appropriations, 11

(Committee on Appropriations, September 7, 2011, “ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2012”, http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/cpquery/?&sid=cp112ncvda&r\_n=sr075.112&dbname=cp112&&sel=TOC\_28798&)

The administration has discussed a proposal as a part of the fiscal year 2012 budget request to expand the authorized uses of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund [HMTF] so that its receipts are available to finance the Federal share of efforts carried out by several agencies in support of commercial navigation through the Nation's ports. No legislative proposal to provide for this expansion has been forthcoming from the administration. The administration asserts that work that other Federal agencies perform at our Nation's ports would be more appropriately charged to the HMTF rather than the general treasury. However current law limits funds in the HMTF to be used only for maintenance of waterways and harbors.

#### Port expansion unpopular—appropriation decisions

Edmonson, 10

(R.G. Edmonson, August 2010, Journal of Commerce, “SHIFTING TIDE FOR WATERWAYS FUNDING”, http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/52920781/shifting-tide-waterways-funding)

The article reports on the U.S. Congress Transportation and Infrastructure Committee's approval of the 2010 Water Resources Development Act (WRDA). It criticizes the bill's priority for environmental restoration over navigation projects. The author explains that WRDA authorized a total of 32 environmental restoration and protection projects and only four small navigation projects in New Jersey, New York, Michigan and Wisconsin.

#### Waterways unpopular—funding mechanism hurts consumers

Quinlan, 11-- Deputy Director of NC Sustainable Energy Association

(Paul Quinlan, Deputy Director of NC Sustainable Energy Association, October 3, 2011, The New York Times, “Industry, Obama Admin Wrestle Over Funding for Waterway Maintenance”, http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2011/10/03/03greenwire-industry-obama-admin-wrestle-over-funding-for-26677.html?pagewanted=all)

President Obama's plan that calls for shipping interests to pick up more of the tab for channel-deepening projects and repairing and upgrading locks and other infrastructure along waterways is facing fierce industry opposition. Michael Toohey, president and CEO of the Waterways Council, an industry group, decried the plan as a massive tax increase. "The proposed legislation would more than double the amount of taxes and fees on one beneficiary of our nation's waterways: commercial shippers," Toohey said in a statement. "These new economic burdens will disrupt the fragile economic recovery by unfairly disadvantaging consumers who will surely pay more for their goods and electricity."

#### Waterways unpopular—both House and Senate dislike funding Army Corps

Quinlan, 11-- Deputy Director of NC Sustainable Energy Association

(Paul Quinlan, Deputy Director of NC Sustainable Energy Association, October 3, 2011, The New York Times, “Industry, Obama Admin Wrestle Over Funding for Waterway Maintenance”, http://www.nytimes.com/gwire/2011/10/03/03greenwire-industry-obama-admin-wrestle-over-funding-for-26677.html?pagewanted=all)

"If they really want to spend a lot more money on the inland waterway system, a lot more of that money has to come for the inland waterway users," said Steve Ellis, vice president of the nonpartisan Taxpayers for Common Sense. "Otherwise, it's going to come from every other corps constituency." At issue is an Army Corps budget that has taken a pounding on Capitol Hill. Both the House and Senate are proposing to roll the corps' civil works budget back to 2005 levels next year, effectively making competition for project funding a zero-sum game.

### Sustainable Transportation Drain Capital

#### Sustainable transportation policies drain capital – The House will block based on voting demographics.

Freemark ‘12

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – February 6th, 2012 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/06/time-to-fight/)

The strange and laudable part of the Senate side of the story — at least as compared to the House — is the bipartisan nature of decision-making there. Why are Republicans in the Senate promoting a transportation bill that explicitly would promote multimodalism as a goal, in a contrast to the highway focus of their peers in the House? Why are they accepting environmental criteria as appropriate measures of quality in transportation policy? Perhaps the Democratic Party’s control of the Senate makes fighting such ideas a waste of time. Or perhaps longer Senate terms in office allow clearer, more reasonable thinking. Whatever the reason, in the long-term, it is hard to envision reversing the continued growth of the GOP’s strident opposition to sustainable transportation investments in the House. As I have documented, density of population correlates strongly and positively with the Democratic Party vote share in Congressional elections; the result has been that the House Republicans have few electoral reasons to articulate policies that benefit cities. Those who believe in the importance of a sane transportation policy need to make more of an effort to advance a sane transportation politics to residents of suburban and rural areas, who also benefit from efforts to improve environmental quality, mobility alternatives, and congestion relief, but perhaps are not yet convinced of that fact. Doing so would encourage politicians hoping for votes outside of the city core — Democratic or Republican — to promote alternatives to the all-highways meme that currently rules the GOP in the House.

### Tiger –extensions cost capital

#### White House would have to get involved in Tiger-extensions

Freemark ‘10

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “After Two Years of Democratic Control in Washington, A Transportation Roundup” –

December 29th, 2010 -- http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2010/12/29/after-two-years-of-democratic-control-in-washington-a-transportation-roundup/)

Two years of Democratic Party power in Washington, then, meant quite a few improvements to the nation’s transportation policy-making, bringing to the fore projects that have been largely ignored by the government for decades. The Obama Administration and its allies in Congress have made clear their collective interest in funding projects that are founded on the idea that transportation can be an important element in the creation of livable cities. This represents a significant and positive change from past federal policy. But there is more work to be done. Republican control of the House of Representatives is unlikely to simplify the extension of many of the new programs undertaken over the past two years — from high-speed rail to TIGER. Though these programs have faced some controversy and should be made more transparent, they have been well-managed, largely fair in their distribution of grants, and, crucially, have spread funding to cities across the country, in both Red and Blue states. In order to assure their future, President Obama will have to articulate their positive effects nationwide and advance ways to fund them that appear bipartisan and consensus-worthy. Will he make the effort to do so when the nation has so many other pressing needs? Is there enough political support on either side of the aisle to maintain a major federal commitment to transport policies that do not revolve around the construction of highways?

#### TIGERs Controversial – Congress fighting

Szakonyi 4/5

(Mark, Associate Editor for The Journal of Commerce,

http://www.joc.com/infrastructure/tiger-grant-demand-outpaces-supply-20-1)

“We simply cannot make the investments we need to build the nation we want without a long-term transportation plan, and it is up to Congress to pass such a plan,” LaHood wrote. “But Congress has failed to come together on what has traditionally been an issue with bipartisan support.”

#### Democrats like TIGER grant

Coil 6/20,

(Kate, writer for Bluefield Daily Telegraph,

http://bdtonline.com/local/x651523273/King-Coal-Highway-officials-await-word-on-fed-funds)

Rahall, who serves as the top Democrat on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, said funding like TIGER grants are essential with the lack of a long-term federal highway bill.  “In a funding desert, with the House Republican leadership unable to produce a long term highway authorization bill, a misguided Congressional ban on earmarks, and competition for TIGER grants at an all-time high, this funding is a sweet oasis,” Rahall said. “Mark my word, this federal commitment recognizes the long-term investment benefits of the Coalfields Expressway. It underscores the projects’ importance to our economy and builds on the funding Senators Byrd and Rockefeller and I have secured over the years. It is a clear signal to our state partners, that if they were to pony up some of their federal discretionary money, it would move the project even further along and it sets the stage for future investment from administrations on the federal level.”  U.S. Sen. Jay Rockefeller, D-W.Va., said projects like the Coalfields Expressway are vital to economic development in southern West Virginia.  “This is a vital project and it’s great news that it will receive this essential funding to upgrade this highway, improve safety for the cars that use it, and create jobs,” Rockefeller said.  “For our businesses and communities to grow and thrive, we need reliable, efficient roads to connect the various parts of our state and to connect West Virginia to other states. This road is doing that and this funding will help continue that goal forward.”

#### Republicans hate TIGER Grant

Marinucci 6/22,

(Carla, *is The San Francisco Chronicle's senior political writer*

http://www.sfgate.com/politics/article/Pelosi-scolds-GOP-for-inaction-on-transportation-3656988.php)

House Minority Leader [Nancy Pelosi](http://www.sfgate.com/nancy-pelosi/), in her hometown Friday, slammed [House Republicans](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=politics&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22House+Republicans%22) for focusing on Attorney General [Eric Holder](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=politics&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Eric+Holder%22) while failing to deliver key transportation legislation as she touted a federal grant for the Mission Bay neighborhood that she said would deliver what Americans want most: "jobs, jobs, jobs." Pelosi made the comments in response to reporters' questions as she stood with San Francisco Mayor [Ed Lee](http://www.sfgate.com/ed-lee/) to introduce a $10 million [Department of Transportation](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=politics&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Department+of+Transportation%22) grant for infrastructure at the Mission Bay biotech cluster and its [UCSF hospital](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=politics&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22UCSF+hospital%22). The grant toward a $46.5 million project will help build pedestrian, rail and highway infrastructures and was awarded on a competitive basis. Pelosi scolded House Republicans for their lack of action on transportation issues while voting to hold Holder in contempt for failing to provide documents to a House investigative committee. "We need jobs now, and what do we have? No transportation bill, 100 days after it passed in the [United States Senate](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=politics&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22United+States+Senate%22), on a bipartisan basis," she said. Pelosi laughed when asked about GOP critics including [Karl Rove](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=politics&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Karl+Rove%22), who referred to her as "the Mad Red Queen" this week. The comments were made after Pelosi said House Republicans, led by California Rep. [Darrel Issa](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=politics&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Darrel+Issa%22), R-Vista (San Diego County), cited Holder for contempt of Congress in the "Fast and Furious" guns investigation as a cover to quash his efforts to stop voter suppression. Pelosi said the Tiger grant - which stands for Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery - provided a contrast with the lack of actions by Republicans in Washington. "The [Golden Gate Bridge](http://www.sfgate.com/golden-gate-bridge/) and the Bay Bridge were built when times were tough," she said, adding that President Eisenhower, "a great Republican president," initiated the federal highway system. But House Speaker [John Boehner](http://www.sfgate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=politics&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22John+Boehner%22), she said, "bless his heart, has never voted for a transportation bill, even when everyone else was voting for a transportation bill."

### Urban Planning—Public Likes

#### Majority of Americans like urban planning, poll shows

Benfield 6/18

(Kaid, Director, Sustainable Communities, NRDC; co-founder, LEED for Neighborhood Development rating system; co-founder, Smart Growth America coalition; “Poll shows that Americans like planning, after all. But the details are messy.” (June 18, 2012, http://switchboard.nrdc.org/blogs/kbenfield/poll\_shows\_that\_americans\_like.html)

If you’re reading this blog, you may know that the American Planning Association last week released the findings of a major public opinion poll showing that “two-thirds of Americans believe their community needs more planning to promote economic recovery,” to lift a phrase from APA’s press release. That’s good news for those of us who believe a more thoughtful and forward-looking approach is needed to guide issues such as land use, education and economic development to secure a more sustainable future for our cities and towns. But, in a world where almost two-thirds of Republicans and two-fifths of all voters told pollsters “the government should stay out of Medicare,” what do survey results mean, exactly? In a poll where community planning was defined as "a process that seeks to engage all members of a community to create more prosperous, convenient, equitable, healthy and attractive places for present and future generations," it is almost inconceivable that anyone would be opposed. So, is two-thirds a strong number or a weak one? What if planning had been defined more neutrally as “a process where local government works with citizens to chart future directions for the community’s land use, economic development, and services”? I like to think that planning still would have claimed a majority of those who expressed an opinion. In the actual poll, 66 percent said that their communities need planning as defined above; 17 percent said they didn’t know; and only 17 percent actually opposed engaging citizens in the process of creating more prosperous, convenient, equitable, healthy and attractive places. Discounting the “I don’t know” respondents, four-fifths of those who expressed an opinion came out in favor of community process for a better future. I suspect that, with the adjectives removed from the definition, the portion of “don’t know” respondents would go up, as might the “process is not needed” group. But I still think most Americans really do believe in community planning and probably wish their community had benefited from more of it in recent decades. In fact, in another part of the poll, 72 percent of respondents said that the word “planning” has a “very” or “mostly” positive meaning. Half the respondents indicated that they would like to be involved in community planning, “including majorities of nearly all of the demographic sub-segments.”

### Urban Planning—Congress Likes

#### Congress likes urban planning, voted down funding cuts to transportation and planning

The American Planning Association 6/27

(“UPDATE: House Rejects Amendments Attacking CDBG, HOME” June 27, 2012, http://blogs.planning.org/policy/)

Strong, bipartisan majorities in the House defeated a series of amendments targeting funding for HUD’s Community Development Block Grant and HOME programs. The amendments came as the House considers the annual funding bill for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development. Rep. Tom McClintock (R-Cal.) proposed an amendment to completely eliminate all CDBG funds. An amendment from Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah) would have cut nearly $400 million from CDBG keeping it at FY 2012 levels. Similarly, Rep. Jeff Flake proposed cutting $200 million from HUD’s HOME program. The final votes demonstrated broad support for these programs: McClintock amendment defeated, 80 – 342 Chaffetz amendment defeated, 157 – 267 Flake amendment defeated, 178 – 242 A number of House members spoke in support of CDBG and HOME on the floor. Several pointed out the economic benefits of the programs and noted that both programs had already experienced deep cuts in recent years.

#### Congress interested in promoting urban planning and transportation, recent decision shows

Jordan 12

(Jason, APA Director of Policy and Government Affairs, “Senate Passes Transportation Bill, Next Stop Uncertain.” March 14, 2012, http://blogs.planning.org/policy/page/2/)

A strong, bipartisan majority in the U.S. Senate has voted for a 2-year, $109 billion surface transportation bill. The measure, S. 1813, was approved 74 to 22 following several days of amendment votes. Find out how your Senators voted. The Senate bill maintains existing funding levels for key transportation programs with a slight inflation adjustment. After the inclusion of some important amendments, the measure also maintains support for bike, pedestrian, and safety programs. The bill would also promote new performance measures in planning, encourage transit oriented development, expand the federal TIFIA program, and restore the transit commuter tax benefit. Senate passage was hailed by transportation advocacy groups across the political spectrum.

## \*\*\*Relations Mechanics\*\*\*

### AT: Magnitsky

#### Magnitsky amendment won’t affect overall relations—numerous discussions with Russia already

Associated Press, 6/27

(Associated Press, June 27, 2012, “Clinton worries about human rights in Russia, optimistic about overall US-Russian relations”, http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/europe/clinton-optimistic-over-us-russian-relations-and-repeal-of-jackson-vanik-bill/2012/06/27/gJQAm7Pi6V\_story.html)

HELSINKI — U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton says she’s optimistic that relations with Moscow will not suffer despite planned legislation in Congress that would impose tough sanctions on Russian human rights violators. She told reporters in Finland on Wednesday that the concerns could be expressed “without derailing the relationship (with Moscow) and that is what we are working with our Congress to do and we have every reason to believe we can accomplish that.” Following talks with Finnish Foreign Minister Erkki Tuomioja, Clinton told reporters that “we discussed this directly with President (Vladimir) Putin when I was with President Obama in Mexico. We made it very clear that, you know, we do have concerns about human rights in Russia.” “We are very keen in the administration for repealing the Jackson-Vanik bill because we want to open doors to greater trade and investment between our two countries,” the secretary said. “However there is great concern in our country, and in particular in our Congress over human rights in Russia,” she added, “and in particular the case of the lawyer Mr. Magnitsky, who died in prison.”

#### Magnitsky bill out of committee—Obama PC key to stop its passage

Astrasheuskaya 6/27

(Nastassia Astrasheuskaya reporter 06/27/12 http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/27/us-usa-russia-rights-idUSBRE85P1AR20120627)

(Reuters) - Moscow expressed outrage on Wednesday over a U.S. Senate panel's approval of a bill that would penalize Russian officials for human rights abuses, and warned Washington that adoption of the sanctions would force Russia to respond in kind. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed the "Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act," named after a Russian anti-corruption lawyer whose death in 2009 while in pre-trial detention drew widespread condemnation. Despite broad support in Congress, the bill's future remains uncertain, partly because the Obama administration is unenthusiastic about a measure that Russia says would be an unwarranted intrusion into its internal affairs. "The effect on our relations will be extremely negative," Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov was quoted by state news agency Itar-Tass as saying. "We are not only deeply sorry but outraged that - despite common sense and all signals Moscow has sent and keeps sending about the counterproductive nature of such steps - work on the 'Magnitsky law' continues." Ryabkov said adoption of the bill could undo improved ties between Moscow and Washington, part of a policy initiative by President Barack Obama to "reset" relations that were strained under his predecessor George W. Bush. "It appears American lawmakers want to break the positive trend in our relationship with such serious irritants," Ryabkov told Vesti-24 state television. "There is still time for the initiators of the Magnitsky law to again weigh the situation and ponder the consequences." EXPRESS CONCERNS, MAINTAIN RELATIONS U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton downplayed the risk to relations with Moscow. "We made it very clear that we do have concerns about human rights in Russia, and we have concerns in particular about this (Magnitsky) case," Clinton told reporters in Helsinki. "We think there is a way of expressing those concerns without derailing the relationship and that is what we are working with our Congress to do and we have every reason to believe we can accomplish that." The death in police custody of Magnitsky, a 37-year-old equity fund lawyer for Hermitage Capital in Moscow, scared investors and blackened Russia's image abroad. The Kremlin's own human rights council says he was probably beaten to death. The bill would deny visas and freeze the assets of Russians suspected of involvement in his death. Ryabkov reiterated Russia's threat to retaliate with "tough measures" if the bill is passed, in part by passing a tit-for-tat measure denying entry to U.S. citizens it believes are linked to human rights violations. "There will be a response," Ryabkov said. "There will be a symmetrical response, but there will also be a number of additional measures." President Vladimir Putin this month called Magnitsky's death a tragedy, but said Moscow would retaliate if the Magnitsky bill were passed. Mikhail Margelov, chairman of the Russian parliament's upper chamber's international relations committee, said a delegation of Russian lawmakers planned to travel to Washington to discuss the bill with their U.S. counterparts. "The U.S. political establishment still has a chance to turn around the situation if they do not support the bill at the plenary sessions of the House of Representatives and the Senate," Margelov told RIA news agency. "SOVIET-STYLE REACTION" Mikhail Kasyanov, a prime minister during Putin's first term who is now an opposition activist, said Moscow was over-reacting. "All those harsh reactions, that is some kind of Soviet-style reaction, not understanding how nations interact in the 21st century," Kasyanov said at a forum on the Magnitsky legislation in Washington. "That's why just, I'm a little bit disappointed that the government of my country behaves so unresponsibly and inappropriately," he said, speaking in English. Magnitsky was jailed in Russia in 2008 and was awaiting trial on charges of tax evasion and fraud. His colleagues say the charges were fabricated by police investigators whom he had accused of stealing $230 million from the state through fraudulent tax returns. Obama's administration says it understands concerns over rights abuses but that the bill is redundant as Washington has already imposed visa restrictions on some Russians thought to have been involved in Magnitsky's death. However, it has not disclosed their names.

#### Pass of Magnitsky won’t affect Russian ties

Rapsi 6/19

(Rapsi – Russian legal information agency 06/19/12 http://rapsinews.com/legislation\_news/20120619/263491989.html)

If the"Magnitsky" bill is passed by the United States, it will not affect Russian business, Severstal head Alexei Mordashov says. The growing level of cooperation between our two countries strengthens political relations, Mordashov says. “The more mutual investments and economic links we have, the more sustainable political relations between the two countries will be. I don’t think we shall see any problems for Russian business,” Mordashov adds. "There is not any prejudice or negative attitude toward Russia in the United States," he stressed. Sergey Magnitsky, an attorney for the Hermitage Capital Management Fund, was charged with masterminding large-scale corporate tax evasion. He died in a Moscow pretrial detention center in November 2009 after spending a year behind bars. His death sparked a public outcry and triggered amendments to the Criminal Code and a reshuffling of officials in the penal system. Several parliaments, including the U.S. Senate, are considering visa sanctions against Russian officials accused of orchestrating Magnistky's prosecution. On Tuesday, the international committee of the U.S. Senate is expected to vote on a draft bill stipulating sanctions against those Russians allegedly involved in human rights violations in Russia.

#### **Magnitsky won’t destroy relations—likely boosts chances of Jackson-Vanik repeal**

AP 6/27

("Clinton worries about human rights in Russia, optimistic about overall US-Russia relations," [www.washingtonpost.com/world/europe/clinton-optimistic-over-us-russian-relations-and-repeal-of-jackson-vanik-bill/2012/06/27/gJQAm7Pi6V\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/europe/clinton-optimistic-over-us-russian-relations-and-repeal-of-jackson-vanik-bill/2012/06/27/gJQAm7Pi6V_story.html) AD 6/29/12)

HELSINKI — U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton says she’s optimistic that relations with Moscow will not suffer despite planned legislation in Congress that would impose tough sanctions on Russian human rights violators. Clinton says she expects “something to move” on both the repeal of the Jackson-Vanik law and on Congress’ concerns about Russian human rights. She told reporters in Finland on Wednesday that the concerns could be expressed “without derailing the relationship (with Moscow) and that is what we are working with our Congress to do and we have every reason to believe we can accomplish that.” The 1974 Jackson-Vanik Act tied trade with the then-Soviet Union to Moscow’s willingness to allow Jews and other minorities to leave the country. The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is necessary if U.S. businesses are to enjoy lower tariffs and increased access to Russian markets when Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer. Following talks with Finnish Foreign Minister Erkki Tuomioja, Clinton told reporters that “we discussed this directly with President (Vladimir) Putin when I was with President Obama in Mexico. We made it very clear that, you know, we do have concerns about human rights in Russia.” A Senate panel in Washington moved forward Tuesday on a bill that would impose tough sanctions on Russian human rights violators, a measure certain to be linked to congressional efforts to lift the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik trade restrictions. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate approved the measure that would impose visa bans and freeze the assets of those held responsible for gross human rights violations in Russia, as well as other human rights abusers. Specifically, it targets those allegedly involved in the imprisonment, torture and death of lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, who died in a Russian jail in 2009. Clinton said, “We think there is a way of expressing those concerns without derailing the relationship” with Moscow, and she added that is “what we are working with our Congress to do, and we have every reason to believe we can accomplish that.” “We are very keen in the administration for repealing the Jackson-Vanik bill because we want to open doors to greater trade and investment between our two countries,” the secretary said. “However there is great concern in our country, and in particular in our Congress over human rights in Russia,” she added, “and in particular the case of the lawyer Mr. Magnitsky, who died in prison.” “There’s a lot of interest in our Congress over a full, transparent investigation of the circumstances of his death in prison,” Clinton said. “And so our Congress, while they are being asked by the administration to repeal Jackson-Vanik, want to pass legislation that will require the United States government to take action against any persons who are connected with the death of Mr. Magnitsky.”

#### **Magnitsky won’t affect relations- Clinton strives to smooth relations over**

KTVL 6/27

(News Agency, 6/27/12, “Clinton optimistic over US-Russian relations”, http://ktvl.com/template/inews\_wire/wires.international/2946309b-www.ktvl.com.shtml)

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton says she's optimistic that relations with Moscow will not suffer despite planned legislation in Congress that would impose tough sanctions on Russian human rights violators. Clinton says she expects "something to move" on both the repeal of the Jackson-Vanik law and on Congress' concerns about Russian human rights. She told reporters in Finland on Wednesday that the concerns could be expressed "without derailing the relationship (with Moscow) and that is what we are working with our Congress to do and we have every reason to believe we can accomplish that." The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is necessary if U.S. businesses are to enjoy lower tariffs and increased access to Russian markets when Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer.

### J-V key to relations

#### JV repeal is part of the overall reset. Now is a key time to reassure both sides of a positive relationship. If Congress refuses to grant PNTR it will make relations worse on every other issue.

Miller 11

(Jacqueline McLaren Miller 8/15/11 The Reset: Down - but not Out

senior associate at the EastWest Institute <http://www.ewi.info/reset-down-not-out>)

This is far from the only issue bedeviling U.S.-Russia relations. The ongoing application of the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the 1974 Trade Act, which links trade relations to emigration practices, is a long-standing source of Russian ire (see earlier article). Presidents Clinton, Bush, and Obama have been unable to get Congress to graduate Russia from the amendment and grant permanent normal trade relations. Ballistic missile defense also continues to spark controversy. Obama’s decision to move away from Bush’s planned deployment of assets in Poland and the Czech Republic provided just a momentary lull. And the lingering fallout from Russia’s 2008 invasion of Georgia continues to provide ample opportunities for mutual recriminations, including a leaked U.S. intelligence report linking a Russian intelligence official to a bombing near the U.S. embassy in Tbilisi. Despite these contentious issues, the reset has scored some significant successes. To be sure, it was slow to deliver on its initial promises. The negotiations for New START dragged on for over a year, allowing START to expire. After finally concluding negotiations with Russia, the Obama administration had another hard-fought battle in the Senate to get the treaty ratified. But the entry into force of the New START treaty was one of the major foreign policy successes for the Obama administration and its reset policy. There has also been progress in addressing other strategic U.S. concerns, most significantly Iran and Afghanistan. Washington secured Russian agreement on both over-flight rights for lethal cargo and overland transit of non-lethal cargo to resupply the Afghanistan effort. This took pressure off the Pakistan supply route—now estimated to be used for only 35 percent of supply efforts as compared to about 90 percent two years ago. And Russia recently agreed to expand the distribution network by allowing two-way transit and overland shipment of lethal goods. The United States was also able to gain Russian and Chinese support for sanctions against Iran because of that country’s continued intransigence on international inspection of its nuclear enrichment facilities. The benefits of the reset have been mutual, as demonstrated by New START. Moscow also had reason to be particularly pleased when the U. S. implemented the 123 civilian nuclear agreement, laying out the parameters of peaceful nuclear cooperation with Russia that needed to be in place before U.S. and Russian companies could expand commercial collaboration. After the Russian invasion of Georgia, it had been withdrawn from congressional consideration. Another success of the reset is firm U.S. backing for Russia’s World Trade Organization aspirations. It is expected that Russia’s tortured 18-year application process may finally come to an end at this December’s WTO ministerial in Geneva. Russia is the largest economy outside of the organization and Medvedev’s ambitious modernization program needs the benefits of WTO membership What both sides need to understand is that the reset offers the best hope of maintaining cooperation on key areas of mutual concern and keeping inevitable disagreements within reasonable bounds. To that end, leaders in Moscow and Washington should deliver that message to their highly skeptical domestic constituencies more often. The Obama administration needs to undertake a sustained effort with a Congress that is still deeply suspicious of Russia and could still undermine the reset, especially during an election year. And Russian leaders should think twice before they engage in the kind of rhetorical overkill that only fuels Cold War thinking. Angry rhetoric won’t disappear anytime soon, but it needs to be kept in check. Otherwise, both sides are likely to lose out.

#### Our link is reverse causal—a vote where we refuse to lift Jackson-Vanik worsens US-Russian relations—sends a signal of displeasure over human rights:

Åslund, 2011

(Anders, November, a leading specialist on postcommunist economic transformation with more than 30 years of experience in the field, “The United States Should Establish Permanent Normal Trade Relations with Russia,” <http://www.piie.com/publications/pb/pb11-20.pdf>)

The Jackson-Vanik Amendment to the US Trade Act of 1974 was approved at the height of the Cold War, when Russia generated outrage by barring Jews from emigrating. It was sponsored by Senator Henry M. (“Scoop”) Jackson of Washington and Representative Charles Vanik of Ohio. Free emigration for Russian Jews, however, has not been in question since Russia became independent in 1991. The amendment is an outdated remnant of the politics of a distant era, though it remains a major irritant in relations between Washington and Moscow and a political issue in Congress. Many lawmakers, citing a range of disagreements with Russia over human and legal rights in Russia and various foreign policy issues, say that refusal to lift Jackson-Vanik would send a signal of displeasure over these matters. But other tools exist for exerting pressure on Russia that would be more effective and far less destructive to US economic interests. The US government has alternative bilateral and multilateral mechanisms that can be used to engage Russia on human rights questions and political and religious freedoms, such as the US-Russia Bilateral Presidential Commission and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. If necessary, economic sanctions and tailored penalties, including draconian measures, are readily available under other US statutes, such as the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA). Originally, Jackson-Vanik applied to almost all communist countries. Over time, nearly all of them were “graduated” when they joined the WTO. Most entered the WTO without having previously secured PNTR from the United States. Only Ukraine, which became a WTO member in 2008, was graduated by Congress in March 2006 in advance of its WTO accession. All but Moldova have eventually been granted PNTR (Pregelj 2005).

#### Repeal of Jackson-Vanik is the key to relations-outweighs and overwhelms all other issues

Medetsky 2009

(Anatoly, “Putin Links ‘Brave’ U.S. Shift to Trade” Moscow Times, <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/news/article/383672.html>)

Prime Minister Vladimir Putin said Friday that Washington’s decision to abandon plans to build a missile defense system in Europe give him hope that the United States would take further, trade-related steps to improve ties. Moscow is counting on Washington to remove restrictions on the transfer of high technology to Russia and to assist Russia, Kazakhstan and Belarus in joining the World Trade Organization, Putin said at an economic forum in the Black Sea resort of Sochi. “The latest decision by President Obama … suggests good thoughts, and I very much hope that this very right and brave decision will be followed by others,” Putin said. Obama abruptly announced Thursday that he would scrap plans by former President George W. Bush to install elements of a missile defense shield in Poland and the Czech Republic. Obama said Sunday that Russia’s complaints about the proposed shield had not influenced his decision. (Story Page 4.) President Dmitry Medvedev indicated in comments published Friday that Moscow would now be more receptive to U.S. concerns, but he stopped far short of offering to help Washington in its attempt to dissuade Iran from developing a nuclear program. The Bush administration had maintained that the program represented a threat to the United States and its European allies and that the shield was needed to counter it. “The fact that they are listening to us is an obvious signal that we should also attentively listen to our partners, our American partners,” Medvedev said in an interview with Swiss media. But Russia will not make “primitive compromises,” he added. In an interview aired on CNN on Sunday, Medvedev said Russia would not supply Iran with offensive missile systems. (Story, Page 3.) The military, meanwhile, said Obama’s shift on missile defense meant that it would no longer need to ­deploy Iskander missiles in the Kaliningrad region next to Poland, as Medvedev had threatened to do on Nov. 4, the day Obama won the U.S. presidential election. “Finally, reason has won over ambitions,” Deputy Defense Minister Vladimir Popovkin said Saturday on Ekho Moskvy radio. At the Sochi conference, Putin said Obama could go a long way toward further improving ties by abandoning CoCom lists, which banned high-tech exports to the Soviet Union and its allies during the Cold War. CoCom stands for the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls created by NATO after World War II. “This causes damage to Russia’s cooperation with its partners, first of all the United States,” Putin said. “This causes damage to the U.S. businesses as well because it hampers them in developing ties with Russia.” Putin urged U.S. participants of the Sochi forum to try their best to promote eradicating such “vestiges of the past epoch” as soon as possible. U.S. attendees included David Bonderman, founding partner of TPG, one of the world’s largest private equity firms; General Electric chief executive Jeff Immelt; and John Mack, whose term as CEO of Morgan Stanley expires at the start of 2010. In addition to the trade barriers that Putin mentioned, Russia has been urging the United States for years to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment, Cold War-era legislation that still prevents Russia from obtaining the status of a country that enjoys “normal trade relations” with the United States. Russia desperately needs investment as it emerges from the economic recession, Putin said. The government will soon begin drafting a crisis-exit strategy that will focus on modernizing the economy by offering investors the “most favorable terms and prospects of growth,” he said. Officials realize that the “era of easy, cheap money is, of course, over” and competition for investment will be “extremely tough,” Putin said. Foreign investors, meanwhile, have not modified their Russia wish list much over the past decade or more, said Torbjörn Becker, director of Stockholm Institute of Transition Economics, a center for research and policy advice in transition economies. At the top of the list is a corruption-free business environment and a strong, independent legal system, he said. “I am not sure we will see it, but that’s certainly what we would like to see,” Becker said. Some of the key industries that will require investment are transportation, energy, telecoms and digital television, Putin said. He talked at more length about the need to manufacture top-of-the-line car parts in Russia, given that some leading global carmakers, including Renault, operate assembly lines here. “It’s time to make the next step,” he said. “It will be economically viable.” Renault is already in talks with Russian car parts makers to create a network of suppliers for itself and partners Nissan and AvtoVAZ, Renault’s chief of Eurasia division said earlier this month in an interview with The Moscow Times. Russia is interested not so much in foreign money as expertise that comes with global investors, Putin said.

### 2NC AT: Putin Kills Relations

#### Relations will be ok under putin

**Pifer 3/5**

(Steven Pifer, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Center on the United States and Europe, “What Putin’s Return to the Presidency Means for U.S.-Russia Relations,” 3/5/12) <http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2012/0305_russia_pifer.aspx>

On May 7, Vladimir Putin will be inaugurated as Russia’s president, reclaiming the position that he ceded to Dmitry Medvedev in 2008. That raises questions for Washington, which became comfortably accustomed to dealing with Medvedev. Putin’s return portends a more complicated bilateral relationship, but it should not go over a cliff. Here are five points to consider. A flag, displaying a portrait of Vladimir Putin flies during a rally to support Putin near the Kremlin in central Moscow March 4, 2012. First, although Putin as prime minister was nominally number two to Medvedev, there is no doubt who held real power. As the American Embassy in Moscow reportedly put it, Putin played Batman to Medvedev’s Robin. Batman kept a close watch on things. The New START Treaty, expanded supply routes through Russia for NATO forces in Afghanistan, and Moscow’s support for an arms embargo on Iran would not have happened had Putin opposed them. His return to the presidency should not mean a different strategic approach toward the United States. Second, the tone of bilateral relations—particularly at the highest level—will change. Putin spent his formative years in the 1980s as a KGB officer, when the United States was the “glavniy protivnik,” the main opponent. As his rhetoric during the election campaign made clear, he holds a wary skepticism about U.S. goals and policies. For example, his comments suggest he does not see the upheavals that swept countries such as Georgia, Ukraine, Tunisia or Egypt as manifestations of popular discontent but instead believes they were inspired, funded and directed by Washington—and that the ultimate target is Russia. Putin’s experience as president dealing with the Bush administration, moreover, was not a happy one. Putin extended himself early on, supporting U.S. military action against the Taliban and calmly accepting U.S. withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, but he believes that he received little in return. In his view, Washington made no effort to accommodate Moscow’s concerns on key issues such as strategic arms limits, missile defense deployments, NATO enlargement or graduating Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment. The reset, after all, took place during Medvedev’s presidency. Third, Putin faces tough issues at home, both economically and politically. The Russian economy and government revenues remain overly dependent on exports of oil and natural gas. While Medvedev called for economic modernization and diversification, there are few signs of a realistic plan to achieve those aims. And Putin made a number of electoral promises, including higher salaries, rising pensions and greater defense spending, that will need to be funded. Moreover, for the first time in his experience, Putin will have to deal with the outside world without being confident that he has a solid political base at home. It will be interesting to see how that affects his foreign policy. Soviet and Russian leaders in the past resorted to the enemy image to rally domestic support, and one can see aspects of that in Putin’s campaign. But the constituency to whom that appeals is already in Putin’s camp; will the ploy resonate with an increasingly unhappy urban middle class? He may conclude that he can focus better on domestic challenges with a less confrontational relationship with countries such as the United States. Fourth, Putin has shown himself to be realistic, particularly when it comes to money. A major article that he published in the run-up to the election described a large military modernization program designed to reassert parity with the United States. But during his first presidency, when huge energy revenues flowed into the Russian government budget from 2003 to 2007, Putin chose not to significantly increase defense spending. Instead, the extra money—and there was plenty of it—went to build international currency reserves and a “rainy day” fund on which the government drew heavily during the 2008-09 economic crisis. He understands that having a large arsenal of weapons did not save the Soviet Union. If circumstances force Putin to make tough choices, he may prove pragmatic and not necessarily choose guns over butter. Fifth, Putin likely will not fully show his hand regarding the United States until 2013. He expects to be around for another six and possibly twelve years. He may see little harm in waiting six months to learn who will be his opposite number in the White House. The upshot is that Putin’s return could and probably will mean more bumpiness in the U.S.-Russia relationship. He will pursue his view of Russian interests. On certain issues, those will conflict with U.S. interests, and Washington and Moscow will disagree, perhaps heatedly. Putin’s style will differ markedly from Medvedev’s. But he is not likely to seek to turn the relationship upside down or take it back to the grim days of 2008. For all the rhetoric now, we should not rule out that the American president will be able to deal with Putin.

#### Putin’s changed—won’t destroy relations

Reuters 6/22

(Timothy Heritage, staffwriter, 6/22/12, “Russia's Putin: Who does he want to be in new term?”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/22/us-russia-putin-idUSBRE85L0WG20120622)

Some of his actions inside Russia since his return to the presidency have also been typical of the man who ruled with a firm grip as president from 2000 until 2008. Burnishing his macho image with antics such as bare-chested horse-riding, he reined in Russia's rebellious regions, defeated rebels in a war in the Chechnya region and clipped the wings of oligarchs who had amassed political power as well as wealth. One of the first legislative acts of his new presidency was the passage of a law that drastically increased fines for protesters who violate public order, and police raided the homes of opposition leaders before a rally this month. Yet on Thursday Putin said there was a place for protests, provided they were within the confines of the law. These are words that Putin would once never have been expected to say. "I am convinced a democratic political system must not only guarantee the legitimacy of the authorities but people's confidence in its just nature to protect the interests of the majority. Nevertheless the interest of the minority must be taken into account and also reasonably protected," he said. Like the foreign investors wary of counting on Putin's promises of economic reform, opposition leaders are skeptical about his remarks, noting that he had made clear he reserved the right to crack down if protesters step out of line. "He can say whatever he wants but in fact his words and actions are clearly quite the opposite of each other, as the police are searching our homes. This is just rhetoric," said Gennady Gudkov, an opposition member of parliament. But the message from aides is that Putin realizes the world's largest country - a nuclear superpower - has changed and that he must change with it. "His speech (to investors) was addressed to people who understand that we are in a different shape. We have different goals now," said First Deputy Prime Minister Igor Shuvalov. "We are the same people and he is the same person in his third term, but the ambitions are different." The question for protesters as well as investors is whether Putin acts on his promises or is merely paying lip service to what he thinks they, and foreign governments, want to hear. "The key with Russian policy now is to see what they do as opposed to what they say," said Jim O'Neill, Chairman of Goldman Sachs Asset Management. "It's what he does that matters."

#### The return of Putin will not affect relations.

Nesnera ‘11

(André de Nesnera . October 7, 2011. “Putin Presidency Unlikely to Derail US-Russia Relations”. October 7, 2011. http://www.voanews.com/english/news/europe/Putin-Presidency-Unlikely-to-Derail-US-Russia-Relations-131345683.html)

Legvold says the relationship could be affected by the outcome of the U.S. election. “We know what the outcome will be in the Russian election," he said. "In Washington, in the Obama administration, the expectation is continuity in Russia policy, basic continuity coming out of the March elections. But I think it is very difficult to predict continuity coming out of the November 2012 U.S. election.” Many experts agree with Legvold that there will not be any real change in U.S.-Russia relations with Vladimir Putin back as president. Matthew Rojansky at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, says Putin, as prime minister, if not calling all the shots, at least approved the key decisions related to U.S. relations. “So for example, I don’t see New START [strategic arms agreement] being rolled back," said Rojansky. "I don’t see cooperation on Afghanistan being rolled back. The Libya [U.N.] resolution [imposing a no-fly zone] which Russia didn’t block was a difficult call and Putin certainly had reservations and you heard him expressing those reservations. But did he ultimately come to some kind of consensus with Medvedev? Clearly he did. I think the two of them operate as a unit.”

#### Putin’s return will not threaten relations.

Ivanov ‘11

(Eugene Ivanov. “Resetting Putin”. October 10, 2011. Russia Beyond the Headlines. http://rbth.ru/articles/2011/10/10/resetting\_putin\_13554.html)

A consensus is emerging among Russia-watchers that Vladimir Putin’s return to the Russian presidency will have little impact on the country’s foreign policy and, in particular, on U.S.-Russia relations. Andrew Kuchins, of the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, D.C., has eloquently summarized this sentiment: “The possible election of Putin as the president of Russia will not signify a fundamental change in the direction of U.S.-Russia relations. The main reason for this is the fact that no major decisions on foreign or domestic policy during the period of Dmitry Medvedev’s presidency have been made without implicit or explicit support from Mr. Putin.” In other words, Medvedev’s foreign policy decisions were always those of the tandem, and the tandem’s decisions were always those of Putin. Or, paraphrasing the Russian poet Vladimir Mayakovsky: when we say Medvedev, we mean the Tandem, and when we say the Tandem, we mean Putin.

### 2NC AT: Alt Causes

#### Syria won’t hurt US-Russian relations- if Russia is given incentive, it will stop arms sales

Reuters 6/26

(Thomas Grove, staffwriter for Reuters, 6/26/12, “Syria to get more arms from Russia soon: think-tank”,

http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/26/us-syria-russia-arms-idUSBRE85P0T220120626)

The report did not mention accusations - made by a Syrian defence official who defected as well as by rebels - that deliveries of Russian small arms have increased since the uprising against Assad's 14-year rule began. The report from CAST, which maintains good relations with Russia's arms industry, also made no mention of contracts between Moscow and Damascus for BMP-2 vehicles, which amateur videos show operating in Homs and other cities during army shelling. Russia, a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council with the power of veto, has been one of Assad's staunchest allies and has shielded Syria from harsher international sanctions. But the report suggested Russia would be amenable to freezing arms sales if it was convinced it was in its interests to end its relationship with Assad. "Arms cooperation with Syria does not carry so much importance for Russia, neither on a commercial nor a defence relationship," it said. "If there is a break in future deliveries to Syria, it is probable that (state arms dealer) Rosoboronexport would not have any difficulty in giving the arms ordered by the Syrians ... to a third country." Russia has already frozen the delivery of an S-300 missile system as well as Iskander missiles, the report said, following concerns expressed by Israel that the systems could end up in the hands of the Iranian-backed Islamist movement Hezbollah. A ship reportedly left Russia on Sunday carrying the delivery of Mi-25 helicopters after a failed attempt earlier this month. The delivery was initially stopped after its insurer withdrew its policy last week

#### U.S. resolving concerns over missile defense now.

Cornwell and Wolf ‘11

(Susan and Jim, writers, “U.S. invites Russia to measure missile-defense test,” http://news.yahoo.com/u-invites-russia-measure-missile-defense-test-222346562.html)

The United States has invited Russia to use its own radars and other sensors to size up one or more U.S. missile-defense flight tests as part of a new push to persuade Moscow that the system poses it no threat, a Pentagon official said on Tuesday. The idea is to let Russia measure for itself the performance of U.S. interceptor missiles being deployed in and around Europe in what Washington says is a layered shield against missiles that could be fired by countries like Iran. "These are smaller missiles," Army Lieutenant General Patrick O'Reilly, director of the Pentagon's Missile Defense Agency, told a forum hosted by the Atlantic Council. He referred to current and planned Standard Missile-3 interceptors built by Raytheon Co. They would be ineffective as anti-missile interceptors against a country like Russia, whose strategic deterrent missiles are launched from deep inside its territory, he said. The SM-3 interceptor, to be based on land and at sea, "can't reach that far." President Barack Obama pleased the Kremlin in 2009 by scrapping his predecessor's plan for longer-range interceptor missiles in Poland and a radar installation in the Czech Republic, a move that helped to improve U.S.-Russian ties.

#### Repeal leads to coop—Russia has an incentive to work with the US

Adomanis ‘12

(Mark, 25-year old writer based in Washington DC who holds degrees in Russian studies from both Harvard and Oxford, Jon Kyl's Predictable and Distressing Foolishness on Russia, http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2012/03/16/jon-kyls-predictable-and-distressing-foolishness-on-russia/)

What makes Kyl’s attitude possible is the idea that permanent normal trade relations are some sort of “gift” to the Russian leadership. This is, of course, absolutely not the case. As should be obvious from America’s history of failure at sanctioning and economically isolating regimes it considers rivals, Iran, Iraq, Cuba, Belarus, and North Korea come immediately to mind, cutting off trade is virtually guaranteed to ensure an authoritarian regime’s survival. A Russia that is more open to foreign trade is a Russia that is more liberal, transparent, and predicable than a Russia that is closed off. A larger and deeper economic relationship with Russia is precisely what people, like Kyl, who feign concern over its foreign policy ought to be interested in building. Right now Russia’s trade relations with the US are paltry and the Russians have little incentive to take our interests into account because there is very little “ballast“ to the relationship. A Russia that is more linked to the US economically will, by definition, be more receptive to US concerns because it will have something to lose. Additionally, closer economic ties between the two countries will inevitably lead to a reduction in mutual distrust and suspicion: there will be disagreements, even serious ones, but they can be overcome so long as the two sides have some confidence in each other.

### 2NC AT: Relations High

#### Relations have improved, but aren’t high – repeal of Jackson-Vanik increases cooperation

Pifer ‘12

(Steven Pifer, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Center on the United States and Europe, Brookings. 3-21-12. The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship. http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2012/0321\_arms\_control\_pifer.aspx.)

The Obama administration’s “reset” policy has improved the U.S.-Russian relationship. By any objective measure, the relationship is stronger today than it was in 2008, the low point in U.S.-Russian relations after the collapse of the Soviet Union. This does not mean the relationship is without problems. Washington and Moscow disagree on issues such as missile defense in Europe, Syria, the post-Soviet space, and democracy and human rights within Russia. On May 7, Vladimir Putin will return to the Russian presidency. This should not entail a change in the strategic course of Russian foreign policy, though the tone and style will likely differ from that of Dmitry Medvedev. Mr. Putin will have to confront domestic political and economic challenges that may affect his foreign policy choices: he could resort to the traditional Russian tactic of depicting a foreign adversary to rally domestic support as during his election campaign, or he could pursue a more accommodating foreign policy so that he can focus on issues at home. We do not yet know. It remains in the U.S. interest to engage Russia where engagement can advance American policy goals. In doing so, the United States will at times have to be prepared to take account of Russian interests if it wishes to secure Moscow’s help on questions that matter to Washington. For example, U.S. readiness to accommodate Russian concerns in negotiating the New START Treaty contributed to Moscow’s decision to open new supply routes for NATO to Afghanistan and to support a UN Security Council resolution that imposed an arms embargo on Iran. Looking forward in its relations with Russia, the United States should pursue further reductions of nuclear arms, including non-strategic nuclear weapons; continue to explore a cooperative NATO-Russia missile defense arrangement; seek to work jointly to deal with the proliferation challenges posed by North Korea and Iran; and consult on steps to bolster security and stability in Central Asia as the NATO coalition prepares to withdraw its military forces from Afghanistan. The United States should explore ways to increase trade and investment relations with Russia, which could help build a foundation for a more sustainable relationship. While Moscow’s decisions about its business and investment climate—for example, to strengthen rule of law and tackle corruption—are the most important factor in this regard, Congress should now graduate Russia from the provisions of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, an action that is long overdue.

### 2NC AT: Only A Symbol

#### Jackson-Vanik will become more than a symbol in August – undermines relations and the US economy

Miller 11

(Jacqueline Miller is a senior associate at the EastWest Institute. 4-8-11. The WTO and the Reset. http://www.ewi.info/wto-and-reset. )

Jackson-Vanik’s ongoing application has been a major symbolic irritant in the relationship, even though the United States has granted Russia a waiver every year since 1992. But once Russia joins the WTO, which could happen next year, Jackson-Vanik will go from being a symbol of mistrust to inflicting actual harm both to Russia and the U.S.-Russia relationship. Jackson-Vanik is inconsistent with WTO requirements on unconditional application of most-favored nation status. If Russia enters the WTO and is still subject to Jackson-Vanik, the United States will have to invoke the non-application principle, by which a member can opt out of its obligations to a newly acceded member. The United States has invoked non-application before—and is the only WTO member to have done so. Non-application, however, is reciprocal. U.S. businesses would face market barriers in Russia that other companies would not be subject to. Congressional refusal to pass legislation to permanently graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik would then hurt the U.S. economy.

### US-Russia Relations Not Resilient

#### **Relations have been on the rise before, doesn’t last- issues over war in Iraq and Georgia/Ukraine revolutions**

NPR 07

(Gregory Feifer, NPR, 11/30/07, “Tensions Rise in U.S.-Russia Relationship”, http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=11473661)

Personal and Political Relationships But Bush's Russia policy took an about-face during his first meeting with his Russian counterpart, Putin, in the Slovenian capital Ljubljana in June 2001. President Bush emerged smiling. "I looked the man in the eye," he said. "I was able to get a sense of his soul." After the Sept. 11 attacks, Putin was the first head of state to call Bush with his condolences and an offer of support. He agreed to new U.S. bases in former Soviet Central Asia, and he didn't complain when the White House pulled out of the cornerstone 1972 Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty, as part of its plan to set up a new missile defense system. But despite two presidents' seemingly personal relationship, bilateral relations soon resumed a downward spiral. Putin helped lead international protests against the U.S.-led war in Iraq. And the Kremlin saw a new security threat when old, corrupt administrations in the former Soviet republics of Ukraine and Georgia fell during their so-called "color revolutions." The new governments were led by young, pro-Western leaders; Moscow believed Western countries had helped bring them to power to further erode Russia's sphere of influence. Newly flush with money from high global prices for oil, Russia's top export, Moscow began fighting back, reheating Cold War-era anti-Western rhetoric. In a bid to restore his country's great-power status, Putin began flexing his foreign policy muscles through Russia's top commodity, energy.

#### Relations aren’t resilient- Obama fails to reset relations, issues with START treat and trust

Time 10

(Simon Shuster, Time correspondent in Moscow, 3/16/10, “U.S.-Russia Relations: In Need of a New Reset”, http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,1971651,00.html#ixzz1z8cZ8bLZ)

Rogozin puts the matter more bluntly. "Medvedev sincerely believes that Obama can be trusted," he tells TIME. "But that doesn't mean this opinion is shared at every level, especially the levels where the implementation of their agreements is borne out." This reality — the disconnect between what Medvedev pledges and what Russia does — has eroded the spirit behind the reset strategy as well as its practical objectives. Take, for example, the delays in completing the START treaty, which aims to cut the world's two biggest nuclear arsenals by a third. Last July, Obama and Medvedev signed a preliminary deal and appointed negotiators to work out the details. Obama said the deal would be finalized by the end of 2009. But that deadline has come and gone, and no new time frame has been set. Even the agreement on the military transports has gotten tangled up in its implementation. On paper, the deal allows 4,500 U.S. military flights over Russia per year, but so far this year, there have been fewer than 100. Perhaps more disturbing is the return of Cold War rhetoric ahead of Clinton's visit. The most alarming exchanges have centered on a new missile shield being proposed by Obama to protect against threats from Iran and North Korea. The new shield would be built farther away from the Russian heartland, but it has still roused the same fury from Moscow, which last month renewed its threat to point tactical missiles at Europe. And in December, Putin suggested the possibility of a new arms race between the Cold War foes. from Putin's United Russia Party, says these escalations point to the conservative camp's main problem with the U.S.: a lack of trust. "There are people at the top who see Obama as just a temporary man who will soon be replaced by another," Markov tells TIME. "There are people at the top who say this reset is all just a trick, that if we go along with it, they will begin pushing for maximum limitations on Russia's influence." Conservatives also want something in return, he says. "What Russia wants is to be recognized as a great power in the region, a power that defends all its regional interests. But Washington is so far denying Russia this status." How Clinton will deal with the growing tensions remains to be seen. But Obama's dream of wiping the slate clean and seeking real pragmatic ties with Russia has begun to look naive. And it's becoming increasingly clear which Kremlin faction is calling the shots.

#### **Disagreements over Putin’s election and Syria**

NYT 12

(DAVID M. HERSZENHORN and STEVEN LEE MYERS, reporters for the New York Times, 3/6/12, “Despite Kremlin’s Signals, U.S. Ties Remain Strained After Russian Election”, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/07/world/europe/ties-with-us-remain-strained-after-russian-election.html?pagewanted=all)

Now that Russia ’s presidential campaign is over, the Kremlin signaled on Tuesday that it was prepared for its relationship with Washington to get back to normal, potentially including swift cooperation on containing Iran’s nuclear program amid the prospect of a military strike by Israel. But senior American officials suggested that it could take some time to get past the strident anti-American rhetoric that characterized Prime Minister Vladimir V. Putin ’s politicking in recent months, including his strangely personal allegation that Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton was trying to stoke political unrest in Russia. Underscoring the ambivalence in Washington, the Obama administration fiercely debated how to respond to the Russian election, with some officials favoring a strong condemnation of the results. The White House ultimately settled on a tempered statement, not directly congratulating Mr. Putin but saying “the United States looks forward to working with the president-elect.” As of late Tuesday night in Moscow, President Obama still had not called Mr. Putin to congratulate him. But at an afternoon news conference in Washington, Mr. Obama acknowledged the result, noting that a Group of 8 meeting in May at Camp David would “give me a chance to spend time with Mr. Putin, the new Russian president.” Mr. Putin, who won a six-year term on Sunday, had said Mrs. Clinton sent a “signal” to demonstrators to begin street actions in Moscow after Russian parliamentary elections in December that observers said were marred by voter fraud. More broadly, the Kremlin asserted a plot in which the United States was financing opposition groups as well as Golos, the only independent election-monitoring organization in Russia, which gathered evidence of irregularities. In the months since, there have been sharp disagreements over how to handle the violence in Syria, including Russia’s joint veto with China of a Security Council resolution calling on President Bashar al-Assad to step down. Mrs. Clinton recently called those vetoes, at a time when Syrian forces continued to shell civilian neighborhoods, “just despicable.”

#### **Relations were strained over questionable imprisonment of American John Tobin**

ABC News 01

(Jim Heintz, staffwriter for ABC News, 6/3/01, “Student Freed From Russian Prison”, http://abcnews.go.com/International/story?id=80690&page=1#.T-z-PReLPJZ)

American Fulbright scholar John Tobin was released today from a Russian prison after serving half of a one-year drug sentence and winning a parole recommendation, ending a high-profile imprisonment that had strained U.S.-Russia relations. A court approved the parole board's recommendation at today's hearing at the prison in the southern Russian town of Rossosh. Tobin, carrying his possessions in a shopping bag, left the prison escorted by two U.S. Embassy representatives. Tobin did not speak to reporters gathered at the prison. He was to travel to the regional capital of Voronezh before going to Moscow. Tobin became eligible for parole Thursday, the halfway point of his sentence, and the parole board unanimously recommended release, satisfied by his behavior at the prison. Prison warden Nikolai Kravchenko portrayed Tobin as model prisoner who spent his time playing sports, chess, and playing the guitar. Tobin "came to be more understanding of our Russia, of our soul," Kravchenko said. A U.S. Embassy spokesman in Moscow said, "We welcome the news of Mr. Tobin's parole and look forward to providing consular assistance to him." Tobin, 24, was arrested in January amid strain in U.S.-Russian relations, which was exacerbated by claims by the Russian Federal Security Service that Tobin was a spy in training. No espionage charges were filed, however, and Tobin said he was framed on the drug charges because he refused to work for Russian intelligence. Tobin's case has been taken up by members of Congress from Connecticut, who have written to Russian officials and pressed President George W. Bush to take up the case in his meetings with President Vladimir Putin. "We have to get rid of this headache for the [prison] administration," Judge Boris Gladko, of the Rossosh City Court, said Thursday. Prison warden Nikolai Kravchenko earlier had welcomed the signs that Tobin could soon be out of his jurisdiction and back in Connecticut. "I'm probably more interested than anybody in his speedy return home," he said. The prison is a collection of shabby two- and three-story Soviet-era buildings, surrounded by a white brick wall topped with barbed wire on outskirts of town. While journalists waited outside Friday, a horse-drawn wagon delivering bread went into the facility. Kravchenko boasted about the state of his prison, saying U.S. Embassy officials even "expressed their gratitude" to him for ensuring Tobin was held in decent conditions. Most Russian prisons are poorly equipped and disease-ridden**.** Tobin, who was doing political science research in Voronezh, About 300 miles south of Moscow, was convicted in April of obtaining, possessing and distributing marijuana and sentenced to 37 months in prison in Rossosh in the Voronezh region. Later, a higher court overturned the distribution conviction and reduced the sentence to one year. Last December, Edmund Pope, a U.S. businessman convicted of spying and sentenced to 20 years in a Russian prison, was quickly pardoned by President Vladimir Putin as a humanitarian gesture.

#### **The US and Russia can’t agree on arms reduction- lead to strained relations**

The Guardian 10

(The Guardian, 7/8/10, “A rocky road for US-Russian relations”, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/jul/08/us-russia-relations-clinton-tour)

It's been a rocky road for US-Russian relations over the past few weeks. The light-hearted images of Presidents Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev chomping on cheeseburgers in Washington brought some hope of a new era of reconciliation. Yet the arrest of 10 alleged Russian spies in the US only days later and the US secretary of state's tour of eastern Europe and the South Caucasus have done more than enough to question whether relations have truly been "re-set". Arms control was one of the most controversial issues raised throughout Hillary Clinton's recent five-day tour of the Ukraine, Poland, Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia. Last April, as a sign towards improved US-Russian relations, Obama and Medvedev signed an arms control treaty that would see both countries cut their nuclear arsenals by a third by 2017. However, Russia said then that it was prepared to withdraw from the treaty if the US increased its missile defence system in any way – even to counteract a potential threat from Iran – that would pose a direct threat to Russia's strategic nuclear forces. It is certain that the missile-shield pact that Clinton signed with Poland during her visit will not sit well with the Kremlin. Despite her protestations that the move is not a direct attack on Russia, it will certainly make Russia less willing to collaborate with the US on this issue.

#### **Relations strained over energy- Clinton’s tour of Eastern Europe worried the Kremlin, which has a monopoly of the energy sector there**

The Guardian 10

(The Guardian, 7/8/10, “A rocky road for US-Russian relations”, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/jul/08/us-russia-relations-clinton-tour)

During her visit to Poland, Clinton also broached the idea of exploiting the country's shale gas supplies, thus reopening the gaping wound that is Europe's ongoing energy power struggle. According to the Baker Institute , American moves to expand and develop shale production in Europe would "strengthen the hand of European consumers in dealing with Russia" and thus pose a threat to Gazprom's monopoly, forcing it to make concessions and co-operate with other countries. Few will see these developments as a bad thing given Russia's recent track record, which has seen numerous power struggles over gas supply and overdue payments with the Ukraine , Belarus and other Baltic states paralysing supplies as far west as Poland and Germany. Yet it also ruins any previous Russian notion of brokering a gas deal with Poland . Clinton's pitstop in Azerbaijan also highlighted the geopolitical tensions over energy disputes in the region and American interest in curtailing Russia's overriding control in the sector. The Nabucco pipeline project , which aims to diversify gas suppliers across Europe and thus mitigate Russia's supply monopoly, will provide energy to the EU from the Caspian region and the Middle East. Azerbaijan lies crucially along this line and Nabucco has been seen as a key threat to the Russian-sponsored South Stream gas pipeline. Although a deal signed between Russia and Austria earlier this year will see Gazprom work in tandem with Nabucco's developers – Austrian energy supplier OMV and Italian energy company ENI – the ongoing tensions between the two pipeline projects will surely be exacerbated if the US is seen to be having talks with Azerbaijan. Russia is resolute in stopping the Nabucco project going ahead in an effort to maintain its dominance, particularly after its gas flow "stranglehold" in the region was broken earlier this year following separate gas deals between the EU and Turkey, and China and Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan, respectively. The US secretary of state's visit to the Ukraine and Georgia will also worry the Kremlin. Russia enjoys a certain element of control over Ukraine, particularly in the energy sector. However, following the election of the pro-Russia president Viktor Yanukovych in February, and his subsequent decision to drop the Ukraine's bid to join Nato, the US has actively sought to consolidate ties between the two countries under the US-Ukraine strategic partnership . Clinton also made the position of the Obama administration on the Russo-Georgian conflict very clear: she criticised Russia's military presence in the country, but hastened to add as an afterthought that Georgia should not "provoke" Russia. Her comments on "occupation" also upset the renegade regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia, who deny Russian occupation. The timing of Medvedev's visit, the "spy ring" arrests and Clinton's tour couldn't have been more telling about the veracity of US-Russian relations. Russia's bid to join the WTO still seems a long way away but the US should be warned, as history has shown that the bear, when threatened, will only fight back harder.

### AT Magnitsky

#### Will be watered down so it won’t single out Russia and it won’t effect passage of JV

Cornwell 6/19

(Susan, Reuters, Senate panel delays vote on "Magnitsky" sanctions on Russia, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/19/us-usa-russia-rights-idUSBRE85I19G20120619)

Russia has warned it will retaliate against the United States if the bill goes through. Changes have been made in the Senate version that would water down the bill at the request of President Barack Obama's administration, Senate aides told Reuters. The changes included letting the U.S. government keep secret some names on the list of abusers. The Senate version would also broaden the list to include abusers of human rights "anywhere in the world," a provision some say could keep Russia from feeling singled out, but would also be difficult to implement. The Obama administration says it understands the concerns of the bill's sponsors about rights abuses. But it says the bill is unnecessary as the administration has already imposed visa restrictions on some Russians thought to have been involved in Magnitsky's death - but it has kept their names quiet. The White House is anxious to keep the push for sanctions on rights abusers in Russia from slowing down efforts to get congressional approval of "permanent normal trade relations" with Russia this year. Those efforts are also under threat by lawmakers unhappy about Russia's support for the Syrian government in its bloody crackdown on a revolt against Syrian President Bashar al-Assad. The Magnitsky bill was discussed on Monday between Obama and Russian President Vladimir Putin at a meeting at a G20 summit in Mexico, U.S. envoy to Russia Michael McFaul told reporters there. "The actual facts of the case in the wrongful death were discussed, as well as the legislation," McFaul said. Magnitsky was jailed in Russia in 2008 on charges of tax evasion and fraud. His colleagues say those were fabricated by police investigators whom he had accused of stealing $230 million from the state through fraudulent tax returns. The Kremlin's own human rights council said in 2011 he was probably beaten to death. CARDIN SAYS HE'S NOT WORRIED Democratic Senator Ben Cardin, sponsor of the Senate version of the bill, said he was not concerned by the delay in the committee's vote, because the bill had strong bipartisan support. He brushed aside a reporter's query about whether the delay was engineered to please the Obama administration. "We've been working very closely with the Obama administration," Cardin said. "I am very confident that they are not delaying our action. Doesn't mean they're supporting our action." Cardin defended the inclusion of a "classified annex" provision that would allow the administration to keep some names secret. The bill would still require a public list of rights abusers, and "if there is a national security interest that requires a classified annex, the administration has to justify that" to lawmakers, he said. Republican Representative Kevin Brady, chairman of a key trade committee in the House, said on Tuesday that passing the Magnitsky bill may be necessary to win approval of permanent normal trade relations with Russia, because of lawmakers' concerns about human rights there. Brady said passage of the trade bill would be a "hard lift," but was doable this summer if the Obama administration pushed hard enough.

#### Will be watered down to not offend Russia

Cornwell 6/19

(Susan, Reuters, US Senate's 'Magnitsky' bill could keep names secret, http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/19/usa-russia-rights-idINL1E8HIHLB20120619)

A draft proposal to penalize Russian officials for human rights abuses has been rewritten in the Senate to let the U.S. government keep secret some names on the list of abusers, congressional aides said on Monday. The reworked Senate version, which could still change, upset some supporters of the legislation to create what is known as the "Magnitsky list." They said that keeping part of the proposed list secret would neuter the effect of the bill, which is aimed at exposing human rights violators in Russia. The House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee this month approved the "Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act," named for a 37-year-old anti-corruption lawyer who worked for the equity fund Hermitage Capital. His 2009 death after a year in Russian jails spooked investors and blackened Russia's image abroad. The measure would require the United States to deny visas and freeze the U.S. assets of Russians linked to Magnitsky's death. The bill as originally written in both the House and Senate would make public the list of offenders and broaden it to include other abusers of human rights in Russia. A reworked draft circulating in the Senate and obtained by Reuters would allow the list to "contain a classified annex if the Secretary (of State) determines that it is necessary for the national security interests of the United States to do so." William Browder, CEO of Hermitage Capital, told Reuters he suspected the "classified annex" provision had been inserted at the request of the Obama administration to water down the bill and so avoid offending the Russian government, which opposes the measure.

#### Obama influencing human rights legislation to soften fallout on relations

Inside US Trade, 4/20, Lexis

“HORMATS SAYS ADMINISTRATION ENGAGED WITH CONGRESS ON MAGNITSKY BILL”, BJM

A senior State Department official this week said the Obama administration is working with Sen. Ben Cardin (D-MD) and other members of Congress on the substance of a bill to address human rights in Russia in the light of the fact that several key lawmakers are pressing for action on such legislation as a condition for lifting Russia from the Jackson-Vanik amendment. "We understand the depth of conviction here, and we understand that it is highly likely that some kind of [human rights] legislation is going to pass, and we're just working with members as they deliberate on this," Undersecretary of State for Economic Growth, Energy and the Environment Robert Hormats said after testifying at an April 18 hearing of the Senate Finance trade subcommittee. Hormats stressed that the administration is not resisting efforts by members of Congress to pass legislation akin to Cardin's Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2011, but is providing its own inputs in order to shape the substance of an eventual bill. The administration began these conversations with Congress late last month (Inside U.S. Trade, April 6). "We're not resisting their desire to pass something at all. In fact, we respect their commitment to this issue. It's just a matter of trying to find the right way of doing it," he said. "They'll decide, but we can give them inputs, and we are." The Obama administration had previously refused to negotiate on provisions in the Magnitsky bill, saying it opposed the bill because it could have political repercussions for U.S.-Russia relations. The bill would publicly name Russian officials who are barred from visiting the U.S. as a result of being involved in gross violations of human rights. But the administration shifted its position late last month when it began talking with members of Congress about possible revisions that might make the bill more palatable for the White House. Sources have said one potential revision that has been discussed is to alter the bill so it has global application, rather than being limited to human rights abusers in Russia. This could serve to soften the political fallout in Moscow because the bill would not be specifically targeted at Russia.

.

#### Maginstky bill wouldn’t tank relations

Kasparov and Nemstov 3/15

(GARRY KASPAROV AND BORIS NEMTSOV,co-chairs of the Russian Solidarity movement, The Right Way to Sanction Russia, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304692804577281210489679138.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj)

Jackson-Vanik is a relic and its time has passed. But allowing it to disappear with nothing in its place, and right on the heels of the fantastically corrupt "election" of March 4, turns it into little more than a gift to Mr. Putin. Our economy, like our people, will never truly flourish until Mr. Putin and his mafia structure are expunged. Moreover, if economic engagement is the best way to promote an open society, why does the Obama administration not forge a free-trade pact with Iran instead of levying sanctions? Russia will be joining the World Trade Organization regardless of what the U.S. does. But WTO membership will not undo Mr. Putin's monopolization of political and economic power. If Mr. Putin and his oligarchs believed for an instant that the WTO might weaken their grip, they simply would stay out. The Obama administration is not only attempting to overturn a law, but also its spirit. As Mr. Kissinger did 39 years ago, Amb. McFaul is trying to make the case that human rights should not get in the way of realpolitik and the business of doing business. He reminds us that the State Department already has its own secret list of banned Russian officials, and so nothing more need be done. But the entire object of such laws is to publicly shame and punish the rank and file of Mr. Putin's mob so they know the big boss can no longer protect them. The Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act is an example of such legislation. Replacing Jackson-Vanik with it would promote better relations between the people of the U.S. and Russia while refusing to provide aid and comfort to a tyrant and his regime at this critical moment in history. This, too, would be a policy of principle.

## \*\*\*Impacts\*\*\*

### Relations MPX – war

#### Russian relations key to stop nuclear war and global conflict

Cohen 2000 **–** professor of Russian studies at New York University

(Stephen, Failed Crusade, p. 196-205)

These assurances are manifestly untrue and, coming from U.S. officials, editorialists, an scholars, inexplica­bly myopic and irresponsible. Even leaving aside post­Soviet Russia's enormou stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons, “all of the major fault line of nuclear danger are growing," as we learn from a num­ber of largely unheeded experts, and U.S. policy "simply has not kept up with the expansion of nuclear dangers inside Russia."The truth may not be politically correct or palatable, but the breakup of the Soviet state and Russia's "transition" have made us immeasurably less safe than we have ever been. To understand how unsafe, we must explore more fully a generalization made earlier in this book: What does it mean for our security when a nuclear-laden nation state is, depending on how we choose to charac­terize Russia s condition today, disintegrating, collaps­ing, or merely "highly unstable"?40 The short answer is, no one fully knows, because it has never happened before, which itself means that compared with the rel­ative predictability of the Soviet system and the Cold War, we now live in an era of acute nuclear uncertain­ty. The longer answer is that any significant degree of disintegration, instability, or civil warfare, all of which exist in Russia today, creates not one but several unprecedented nuclear dangers. The most widely acknowledged, almost to the point of obscuring the others, is proliferation-the danger that some of Russia's vast accumulation of nuclear weapons, components, or knowledge might be acquired by non-nuclear states or terrorist groups through theft and black-market transactions, scientific brain drain, or a decision by a money-starved Moscow regime to sell them. The threat derives primarily from Russia's decade­long economic collapse. The government has lacked suf­ficient funds to safeguard storehouses of nuclear materials properly or to pay maintenance personnel and scientists adequately, even regularly. (Nuclear workers actually went out on strike over unpaid wages several times in the 1990s and again in 2000, even though it is against Russian law.) Almost all of the existing U.S. programs to reduce nuclear threats inside Russia focus on proliferation. But even here, according to their official sponsors and other experts, the programs are "woefully inadequate" if we are "to prevent a catastrophe." By the end of 2000, for example, barely one-sixth of Russia's weapons-usable materials will be considered secure, and the "risks of `loose nukes' are larger today" than they were when the programs began. Moreover, Moscow seems to have no full inventory 0f such materials or perhaps even of its thousands of tactical nuclear weapons, and thus no sure way of knowing whether or not something is missing.\*' Proliferation is the pinup of Russia's nuclear dangers, the subject of Western novels and movies, but it may not be the most serious. If a nuclear explosion is wait­ing to happen, it is probably somewhere among Russia's scores of Soviet-era reactors at electrical power stations and on decommissioned submarines. Reactors, we are told, can be no less dangerous than nuclear weapons. And as the Senate's leading expert informed his col­leagues in 1999, Russia's "reactors suffer from defi­ciences in design, operator training, and safety procedures." Indeed, according to a Russian specialist, "none of our nuclear stations can be considered safe."42 The bell began tolling loudly on reactor catastrophes with the explosion at Chernobyl in 1986, the worst nuclear accident in history. Releasing more than a hun­dred times the radiation of the two atomic bombs dropped 0n Japan in 1945, its lethal consequences are still unfolding fourteen years later. Since the early 1990s, many reports. including one by the Russian gov­ernment itself in February 2000, have warned of the possibility of another "Chernobyl-type disaster" or, more exactly, of several accident-prone Russian power stations, even faulty research reactors.' (The world's most dangerous nuclear plants are said to be located in post-Communist Russia and other former Soviet republics.)' Scores of decommissioned but still not denuclearized Soviet-built submarines decaying in the far north great­ly worsen the odds in this new kind of Russian roulette. Here too firsthand reports of "a nuclear accident wait­ing to happen" are increasingly ominous. Ill-maintained floating reactors are highly vulnerable, and many sub­marines are already leaking or dumping radioactive materials into the seas "like little Chernobyls in slow motion. Active-duty Russian nuclear ships also pose a serious threat, their aging missiles susceptible to explosions, one likely to detonate others. If that happens Russian expert warns, "We can end up with hundreds of Chernobyls. Why, then, all the U.S. official and unofficial assur­ances that we are "immeasurably more secure" and ca stop worrying about "worst-case scenarios"? They clear­ly derived from the single, entirely ideological assump­tion that because the Soviet Union no longer exists, the threat of a Russian nuclear attack on the United States no longer exists and we need now worry only about rogue states." In truth, the possibility of such a Russ­ian attack grew throughout the 1990s and is still growing Leave aside the warning that "a Russian version of Milosevic . . . armed with thousands of nuclear war­ warheads" – might come to power and consider the pro­gressive disintegration of the country's nuclear-defense infrastructure. Russia still has some six thousand war­heads on hair-trigger alert. They are to be launched or not launched depending on information about activity at U.S. missile sites provided by an early-warning net­work of radars, satellites, and computers that now functions only partially and erratically. Russia's command-and-control personnel, who are hardly immune to the social hard­ships and pathologies sweeping the nation, have bare­ly a few minutes to evaluate any threatening information, which as already been false on occasion. (In 1995, a Norwegian weather rocket was briefly mistaken by Russian authorities for an incoming enemy mis­sile.) These new post-Soviet technological and human cir­cumstances of the nuclear age are, as American scien­tists have warned repeatedly, "increasing the danger of an accidental or unauthorized "attack on the United States" from Russian territory. It is "arguably already **the greatest threat to** U.S. national survival. Assurances to the contrary, scientists emphasize, are "a gross mis­representation of reality."' Readers may choose to believe that intentional nuclear war nonetheless remains unthinkable. In post- Soviet Russia, however, it has become not only increas­inglythinkable but speakable. The Kremlin's new security doctrine expanding conditions in which it would use such weapons may be merely semantic and nothing really new. But Russia's ferocious civil war in Chechnya, which did not end with the destruction of Grozny **in** 2000, is, as I have pointed out before, the first ever in a nuclear country. It has not yet included nuclear warfare, but both sides have crossed a rhetorical Rubicon. Since '999, sev­eral Russian deputies and governors, and even a lead­ing "liberal" newspaper, have proposed using nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons against Chechnya. Said one, think nuclear weapons should stop being virtual." Russian military spokesmen, we are told, "do not exclude that a nuclear attack could be carried out against the bases of international terrorists in Chechnya."49 And with that tiny republic in mind, the military has officially adopted a new concept of "limited" nuclear warfare in a single region, a threat against the Chechen resistance still being discussed in May 2000. From the other side, there were persistent reports that terrorists serving the Chechen "holy war" might blow up Russian nuclear power plants or weapons sites. The reports were serious enough to cause Moscow to redouble security at its nuclear facilities and go percent of Russians surveyed to say they fear the possibility.' Such threats on both sides may also be merely rhetorical, but it is an exceedingly dangerous rhetoric never before heard. If nothing else, there has been more loose talk in Russia since 1999 about using nuclear weapons than measures to .prevent loose nukes. And it will likely increase if the Chechens expand their new guerrilla tactics farther into Russia itself, as they have promised to do. And so, post-Soviet Russia still matters to America in the most fateful of ways. The Clinton administration has worsened the dangers incalculably by taking step after step that pushes a Russia coming apart at the nuclear seams to rely more and more on its nuclear stockpiles and infrastructures-by making financial aid conditional on economic "reforms" that impoverished and destabilized the state; by expanding NATO's mili­tary might virtually to Russia's borders; by provocative­ly demonstrating during the bombing of Yugoslavia the overwhelming superiority of U.S. conventional weapons; and more recently by threatening to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in order to build a missile defense system. Rarely, if ever, has there been such a reckless official disregard for U.S. national security or leadership failure to tell the American people about growing threats to their well-being. The Clinton administration and its many supporters in the media, think tanks, and acade­mia never seem to connect the dots between their mis­sionary zeal in Russia and the grave dangers being compounded there. In early 2000, one of the crusade's leading policymakers suddenly told us, after seven years of "happy talk," that "disasters are inescapable in the short run." He neglected to say that the disaster is unfolding in a country laden with twentieth-century devices of mass destruction and regressing toward the nineteenth century." Russia's potential for lethal catastrophies is the most important but not the only reason it still matters. Even in crises and weakness, Russia remains a great power because of its sheer size, which stretches across eleven time zones from Finland and Poland (if we consider Belarus) to China and nearby Alaska; its large portions of the world's energy and mineral reserves; its long his­tory of world-class achievements and power; its highly educated present-day citizens; and, of course, its arse­nals. All this makes Russia inherently not only a major power but a semi-global one. A "world without Russia" would therefore be globalization, to take the concept du jour, without a large part of the globe. Nor can many large international problems and con­flicts be resolved without Russia, especially in a "post-Cold War order" that has at least as much inter­national anarchy as order. From the Balkans and the Caspian to China and Iraq, from nuclear proliferation to conventional-arms transfers, from the environment and terrorism to drug trafficking and money laundering, Russia retains a capacity to affect world affairs for better or worse. On the one hand, it was Moscow's diplo­matic intervention in Yugoslavia in 1999 that enabled a desperate Clinton administration to avoid sending American ground troops to Kosovo. On the other, the 1990s also brought the passage of narcotics westward across Russian territory, a flood of illegal Russian money into U.S. banks, and growing markets for Moscow's weapons and nuclear capabilities among states that already worry Washington." And then there are the vast geopolitical ramifications of developments in what is still the world's largest ter­ritorial country. Nearly a fourth of planet Earth's pop­ulation lives on the borders of the Russian Federation, including most of its major religions and many of its ethnic identities. Many, if not all, of these nations and peoples are likely to be directly or indirectly affected by what happens in post-Communist Russia, again for bet­ter or worse-first and foremost the "near abroad," as Moscow calls the other fourteen former Soviet republics, but not them alone. Finally, there is a crucial futuristic reason why U.S. policy toward Russia must be given the highest priori­ty and changed fundamentally. Contrary to those Amer­icans who have "rushed to relegate Russia to the archives," believing it will always be enfeebled and may even break into more pieces, that longtime superpower will eventually recover from its present time of troubles, as it did after the revolution and civil war of 1917-21, indeed as it always has. But what kind of political state will rise from its knees? One that is democratic or despotic? One open to the West and eager to play a cooperative role in world affairs--or one bent on revising an international order shaped during its weakness and at its expense? One safeguarding and reducing its nuclear stockpiles or one multiplying and proliferating them among states that want them? The outcome will depend very significantly on how Russia is treated during its present-day agony, particularly by the United States. Whether it is treated wisely and compassionately or is bullied and humiliated, as a growing number of Russians believe they have been since the early 1990s. The next American president may make that decision, but our children and grandchildren will reap the benefits or pay the price.

#### Only scenario for extinction

Bostrom 2002

(Nick Bostrom, 2002. Professor of Philosophy and Global Studies at Yale. "Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards," 38, www.transhumanist.com/volume9/risks.html)

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization. Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently.

### Relations MPX – Global Stability

#### Russian cooperation critical to global conflict resolution

Trenin 7

Dmitri Trenin is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and director of studies at the Carnegie Moscow Washington Quarterly, Spring 2007, <http://www.twq.com/07spring/docs/07spring_trenin.pdf>

As a permanent member of the UN Security Council, Russia is an important factor in several areas of major significance to the United States. Moscow’s cooperation is a necessary part of any solution to the Iranian nuclear issue that is negotiated in the UN context. It is similarly vital to the North Korean problem, even though China is playing a leading role there. A common position of the five countries negotiating with Pyong­yang, including Russia, is a sine qua non for North Korea taking the six-party talks seriously. Across the greater Middle East, with U.S. policies in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Lebanon and toward the Israeli-Palestinian dispute in crisis, Russia could be a useful partner. It keeps a presence in Central Asia and maintains contacts with the elements of the former Northern Alliance in Afghanistan, which opposed the Taliban for years and joined with the United States to end the Taliban’s rule in 2001. It has a long-standing relationship with Syria, having supplied arms to Damascus for two generations. It has use­ful contacts among the Palestinians and the Lebanese factions and a very vi­brant relationship with Israel, approximately one-fifth of whose population is Russian-speaking. Despite the very different lenses through which the White House and the Kremlin view the war on terrorism, the core interests of each call for collaboration against Islamist extremists.

### Relations MPX – Laundry List

#### Relations key to solve all global problems

Allison and Blackwill, 11 – \* director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School AND \*\* Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations (Graham and Robert, “Russia and U.S. National Interests Why Should Americans Care?”, Task Force on Russia and U.S. National Interests Report, October 2011) <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Russia-and-US-NI_final-web.pdf>

Why Russia Matters to the United States In view of Russia’s difficult history, sometimes troubling behavior, relatively small economy, and reduced international role since the collapse of the Soviet Union, it is reasonable to ask whether the United States needs Moscow as a partner. We believe Russia must be a top priority for the United States because its conduct can have a profound impact on America’s vital national interests: • Nuclear Weapons. President Barack Obama and former President George W. Bush each identified nuclear terrorism as the number one threat to American national security. The United States and Russia together possess 95% of the world’s nuclear weapons and most of the world’s weapons-usable material, and both are major suppliers of civilian nuclear technologies around the world. Also, Russia is the only nation that could destroy America as we know it in thirty minutes. Russia’s meaningful assistance and support is critical to preventing nuclear war. • Non-Proliferation. Russia plays a key role in U.S.-led international efforts to inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons, weapons-usable materials and technologies, which are sought not only by nation states, but also by non-state actors. Moscow has generally supported American initiatives to combat nuclear terrorism and shared intelligence on al Qaeda with Washington. Without Russia’s assistance, the United States will face considerable additional difficulties in seeking to slow down nuclear proliferation and prevent nuclear terrorism. • Geopolitics. Russia is an important nation in today’s international system. Aligning Moscow more closely with American goals would bring significant balance of power advantages to the United States—including in managing China’s emergence as a global power. Ignoring Russian perspectives can have substantial costs. Russia’s vote in the United Nations Security Council and its influence elsewhere is consequential to the success of U.S. international diplomacy on a host of issues. Afghanistan. Al Qaeda operatives have engaged in terrorist attacks against the United States and have encouraged and supported attacks by domestic terrorist groups in Russia. Russia has provided the United States with access to its airspace and territory as a critical alternative supply route for U.S. forces in Afghanistan, something that has grown in importance as America’s relations with Pakistan have deteriorated. Moscow has also shared intelligence on Afghanistan and al Qaeda, helps to train Afghan law enforcement officers, and supplies hardware to them and to the Afghan National Army. • Energy. Russia is one of the world’s leading energy producers and is the top holder of natural gas reserves .Russia thus has a substantial role in maintaining and expanding energy supplies that keep the global economy stable and enable economic growth in the United States and around the world. • Finance. Russia’s membership in the G8 and the G20 gives it a seat at the table for the most important financial and economic meetings and deliberations. • Strategic Geography. Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area and the largest in Europe by population. It is located at a strategic crossroads between Europe, Asia, and the greater Middle East and is America’s neighbor in the Arctic. As a result, Russia is close to trouble-spots and a critical transit corridor for energy and other goods.

### Relations MPX – accidental war

#### Relations key to solve the nuclear infrastructure – accidental conflict

**Cohen, 1**

Stephen F. Cohen, Prof of Russian Studies @ NYU, June 25, 2001 <http://www.thenation.com/doc.mhtml?i=20010625&c=1&s=cohen>

In these and other ways, Russia has been plunging back into the nineteenth century. And, as a result, it has entered the twenty-first century with its twentieth-century systems of nuclear maintenance and control also in a state of disintegration. What does this mean? No one knows fully because nothing like this has ever happened before in a nuclear country. But one thing is certain: Because of it, we now live in a nuclear era much less secure than was the case even during the long cold war. Indeed, there are at least four grave nuclear threats in Russia today: There is, of course, the threat of proliferation, the only one generally acknowledged by our politicians and media--the danger that Russia's vast stores of nuclear material and know-how will fall into reckless hands. But, second, scores of ill-maintained Russian reactors on land and on decommissioned submarines--with the destructive capacity of nuclear weapons--are explosions waiting to happen. Third, also for the first time in history, there is a civil war in a nuclear land--in the Russian territory of Chechnya, where fanatics on both sides have threatened to resort to nuclear warfare. And most immediate and potentially catastrophic, there is Russia's decrepit early-warning system. It is supposed to alert Moscow if US nuclear missiles have been launched at Russia, enabling the Kremlin to retaliate immediately with its own warheads, which like ours remain even today on hairtrigger alert. The leadership has perhaps ten to twenty minutes to evaluate the information and make a decision. That doomsday warning system has nearly collapsed--in May, a fire rendered inoperable four more of its already depleted satellite components--and become a form of Russian nuclear roulette, a constant danger of false alarms and accidental launches against the United States.How serious are these threats? In the lifetime of this graduating class, the bell has already tolled at least four times. In 1983 a Soviet Russian satellite mistook the sun's reflection on a cloud for an incoming US missile. A massive retaliatory launch was only barely averted. In 1986 the worst nuclear reactor explosion in history occurred at the Soviet power station at Chernobyl. In 1995 Russia's early-warning system mistook a Norwegian research rocket for an American missile, and again a nuclear attack on the United States was narrowly averted. And just last summer, Russia's most modern nuclear submarine, the Kursk, exploded at sea. Think of these tollings as chimes on a clock of nuclear catastrophe ticking inside Russia. We do not know what time it is. It may be only dawn or noon. But it may already be dusk or almost midnight. The only way to stop that clock is for Washington and Moscow to acknowledge their overriding mutual security priority and cooperate fully in restoring Russia's economic and nuclear infrastructures, most urgently its early-warning system. Meanwhile, all warheads on both sides have to be taken off high-alert, providing days instead of minutes to verify false alarms. And absolutely nothing must be done to cause Moscow to rely more heavily than it already does on its fragile nuclear controls. These solutions seem very far from today's political possibilities. US-Russian relations are worse than they have been since the mid-1980s. The Bush Administration is threatening to expand NATO to Russia's borders and to abrogate existing strategic arms agreements by creating a forbidden missile defense system. Moscow threatens to build more nuclear weapons in response. Hope lies in recognizing that there are always alternatives in history and politics--roads taken and not taken. Little more than a decade ago, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, along with President Ronald Reagan and the first President George Bush, took a historic road toward ending the forty-year cold war and reducing the nuclear dangers it left behind. But their successors, in Washington and Moscow, have taken different roads, ones now littered with missed opportunities. If the current generation of leaders turns out to lack the wisdom or courage, and if there is still time, it may fall to your generation to choose the right road. Such leaders, or people to inform their vision and rally public support, may even be in this graduating class. Whatever the case, when the bell warning of impending nuclear catastrophe tolls again in Russia, as it will, know that it is tolling for you, too. And ask yourselves in the determined words attributed to Gorbachev, which remarkably echoed the Jewish philosopher Hillel, "If not now, when? If not us, who?"

### Relations MPX --Heg

#### Collapsing US-Russian relations kills US global influence

Simes ‘7 (Dimitri, President of the Nixon Center and Publisher of The National Interest, Foreign Affairs, “Losing Russia; The Costs of Renewed Confrontation,” Nov/Dec – lexis)

But **if** the current **U.S.-Russian relationship deteriorates** further, **it will not bode well for the United S**tates and would be even worse for Russia. The **Russian** general staff is lobbying to add a military dimension to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and some top **officials are beginning to champion the idea of a** foreign **policy realignment** directed **against the West.** There are also quite a few **countries, such as Iran and Venezuela, urging Russia to work with China to play a leading role in balancing the U**nited **S**tates economically, politically, and militarily. And post-Soviet states such as Georgia, which are adept at playing the United States and Russia off against each other, could act in ways that escalate tensions. Putin's stage management of Moscow's succession in order to maintain a dominant role for himself makes a major foreign policy shift in Russia unlikely. But new Russian leaders could have their own ideas -- and their own ambitions -- and political uncertainty or economic problems could tempt them to exploit nationalist sentiments to build legitimacy. **If relations worsen,** the UN Security Council may no longer be available -- due to a Russian veto -- even occasionally, to provide legitimacy for U.S. military actions or to impose meaningful sanctions on rogue states. Enemies of the United States could be emboldened by new sources of military hardware in Russia, and political and security protection from Moscow. **International terrorists could find new sanctuaries in Russia** or the states it protects. And **the collapse of U.S.-Russian relations could give China much greater flexibility in dealing with the U**nited **S**tates. It would not be a new Cold War, because Russia will not be a global rival and is unlikely to be the prime mover in confronting the United States. But **it would provide incentives and cover for others to confront Washington, with potentially catastrophic results**.

#### Relations key to hegemony

The Nixon Center 3

(“ADVANCING AMERICAN INTERESTS AND THE U.S.-RUSSIAN RELATIONSHIP,” http://www.nixoncenter.org/publications/monographs/FR.htm)

At the same time, **U.**S. leaders increasingly recognized the emerging, inter-related threats of terrorism and proliferation.  Though policy makers and experts had devoted some attention to these issues earlier, the tragic events of September 11 rapidly crystallized American thinking about these threats and transformed the struggle to contain them into the principal aim of American foreign policy.  Notwithstanding its diminished status and curtailed ambition, Russia has considerable influence in its neighborhood and a significant voice elsewhere as well.  Moscow can contribute importantly to U.S. interests if it chooses to do so.  Accordingly Russia can markedly decrease, or increase, the costs of exercising American leadership both directly (by assisting the United States, or not) and indirectly (by abetting those determined to resist, or not).

### Jackson-Vanik MPX --Russia Econ

#### Jackson Vanik repeal key to Russian economic modernization

Sanati ‘12

[Cyrus, 3/19/12 The biggest winners of a new Russia trade deal, http://finance.fortune.cnn.com/2012/03/19/russia-trade/?section=money\_topstories&utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+rss%2Fmoney\_topstories+%28Top+Stories%29]

FORTUNE -- On Capitol Hill last week, senators debated the merits of lifting Cold War-era trade sanctions against Mother Russia. Plenty of U.S. companies are eager to see this happen. The trade barriers are widely expected to fall this year, and when they do it will be a net positive for U.S. trade. Russia's creaky and inefficient economy -- from its sad agriculture collectives to its rusty automotive industry -- won't likely be able to compete against the larger and more efficient U.S. industrial and retail firms. Meanwhile, Wall Street could benefit from coaxing U.S. investors to take a second look at Russia, while at the same time convincing Russian firms to consider New York as the place to raise capital or go public. Before any of this can happen, however, the two countries will have to work through the numerous barriers and prejudices that have existed between them for nearly a century. Russia's ascension into the World Trade Organization took 18 years. It first applied in 1993 after the nation shrugged off its communist past and moved to capitalism and it was invited to join the WTO late last year. The transition from a centrally-planned economy to the free market has not been easy. Corruption and backroom dealings have become the norm as the nation's billionaire oligarchs violently protect their turf by any means necessary. From a debt default in 1998 to the invasion of Georgia in 2008, there was always a solid reason for U.S. investors to hold back from the Russian market. The losers in all of this mess have been the Russian people. Russia's economy has not progressed or modernized as it should have and is still highly dependent on energy and mineral exports to keep the nation afloat (Russia is the world's largest oil exporter). High tariffs are imposed to protect certain large and inefficient industries, especially the automotive industry. Doing business in Russia is also difficult given the nation's notoriously corrupt political and judicial structure. Things got so bad that in the last few years, Russia's foreign direct investment was actually negative – unheard of for an emerging market economy. While Russia was accepted into the club in December, the United States still has in place Cold War-era trade sanctions against Russia. The U.S. Senate met last Thursday to discuss dropping these laws so that they could normalize trade relations before Russia formally joins the WTO this summer. The main argument against lifting the so-called Jackson-Vanik amendment derives from Russia's abominable human rights record and its questionable commitment to democracy. Republicans tried to voice their concerns but it was the Democrats that shut them down. President Obama has made the lifting of the amendment a key pillar of his trade policy. So while the Republicans are raising some noise in the Senate, the amendment will almost surely be lifted on Russia, leading to a normalization of trade relations between the two countries. U.S. and European companies will likely benefit the most from an open Russia. The reduction in tariffs on certain goods, especially in the service industry, is expected to benefit U.S. companies hoping to tap the burgeoning Russian middle class. Major interest groups, like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, along with 173 US companies, have sent letters to Congress demanding the normalization of trade with Russia. Some of the big companies behind the push include General Electric (GE), Deere (DE) and Boeing (BA). GE has been especially vocal, saying that tariffs on its jet engines would fall from 20% to 5% if trade was normalized between the two nations. That would deliver a sizable boost to its profit margin and increase the availability of top-notch products to the Russian market. Companies in the agricultural space and the automotive space will also benefit as Russia will no longer be able to bar the importation of certain food stuffs and automobiles. This could be a great boost for major US factory farm companies like ConAgra (CAG) and ADM (ADM) as well as car manufacturers like Ford (F), GM (GM) and Chrysler. Wall Street stands to benefit from all this new investment in Russia too. If Russia is seen as a solid place to invest capital, institutional investors will demand greater access to it. This could lead to a large influx of equity and debt capital into Russia's domestic market, all of which would yield juicy fees for Wall Street bankers. On the flip side, the large Russian companies that currently see London as a base of operation could be lured into moving some of their operations to New York. Currently, most large Russian companies, even the quasi-state owned ones, choose to list their stock in London and even Hong Kong over Moscow given their investor bases. As more of their investor base moves to the western hemisphere it will make more sense to list in the liquid New York markets. The NYSE has been courting Russian companies -- full trade normalization will most likely accelerate this nascent process. And while some Russian companies might move operations to Wall Street, U.S. banks may see new opportunities in Moscow. The WTO rules allow for 100% foreign-owned banks to open in Russia for the first time. The only limit is that 50% of the entire banking sector must remain in Russian hands. But while the benefits of full trade normalization are real, it will be many years before all the changes are implemented. Fearing a shock to some of its industries, Russia will be decreasing its tariffs over a 7-year period and will not be phasing them out. On average, Russian tariffs on imported goods are expected to decrease from 10% to 7.8% when all is said and done. Russia agreed to lower 33% of its tariffs from the date at which they enter the WTO. It will drop them another 25% after three years. Some industries will have much longer lead times than others. Tariffs in the automotive and airline industries will drop in seven years, with the tariff on autos going from 9.5% to 7.3%. Meanwhile some agricultural products have an eight year time lag, with the average agricultural tariff falling from 13.2% to 10.8%. And while the new agreement will allow foreign investment in Russia's insurance industry for the first time ever, it will be nine years before that market is open to investors. The Senate is expected to continue debating Russian trade for a few more weeks, with passage expected in the next few months, according to Senate Democrats. Both U.S. and Russian politicians are cautiously optimistic about this new level of openness and what it might produce. But the net benefits for both countries seem to be solid. The only wild card is whether or not Russia will truly play by the WTO rules. Only time will tell.

#### Repealing Jackson Vanik is key to the Russian Economy and relations

Pifer ‘12

Steve, 3/21/12 senior fellow @ Brookings, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship, http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2012/0321\_arms\_control\_pifer.aspx

Fifth, Washington should seek to expand the trade and investment part of the bilateral relationship with Moscow. It remains significantly underdeveloped for economies the size of those of the United States and Russia. Expanded economic relations would not only generate new export possibilities, but could provide economic ballast to the broader relationship, much as the economic ties between the United States and China provide a cushion for that relationship. The U.S. government should work with Moscow to facilitate a successful Russian entry into the World Trade Organization. Achieving a boost in bilateral trade and investment links, however, will depend more than anything on steps that Moscow takes to improve the business and investment climate within Russia. While the growing Russian market attracts American companies, many are put off by the absence of rule of law, rampant corruption, corporate-raiding and complex tax, customs and regulatory systems. The cases of Hermitage Capital and Sergey Magnitsky sadly testify to the daunting challenges of doing business in Russia, and lead investors and trading companies to turn to other markets. If the Russian government wants to modernize its economy and enjoy the benefits of full integration into the global economic system, it will have to come to grips with these problems. One thing that Congress can do to improve economic relations is to graduate Russia from the provisions of the Jackson-Vanik amendment and grant Russia permanent normal trade relations status. That will increase U.S.-Russian trade; one estimate suggests that American exports to Russia could double. If, on the other hand, the amendment is still in place when Russia accedes to the World Trade Organization this summer, American companies that wish to export to Russia will be disadvantaged. They will not be able to make use of WTO tariff benefits or trade dispute resolution mechanisms. Other countries’ exporters to the Russian market of 143 million people will gain a comparative advantage over their American counterparts. Moreover, Russia long ago met the requirements of Jackson-Vanik. The amendment was approved in 1974 to press the Soviet Union to allow free emigration for Soviet religious minorities, particularly Soviet Jews. In the early 1990s, Russia opened the flood gates for emigration, and hundreds of thousands of Russian Jews left. The only people who had problems securing emigration permission were a small handful who had had access to classified information; in most cases, they were permitted to leave after a few years. While the overall trend on human rights in Russia has been negative since Mr. Putin first became president in 2000, the government has not restricted the freedom to emigrate. Jackson-Vanik has thus achieved its aims with regard to Russia. It no longer offers the United States leverage with Russia. The American Jewish community over a decade ago expressed its support for Russia’s graduation. The leaders of Russian opposition groups support graduation. Its continued application will hurt American business and diminish the impact of threats of future Congressional sanctions against Russia. Should Congress consider sanctions in the future, the reaction in Moscow is likely to be: Why bother to comply? We met the requirements of Jackson-Vanik in the mid-1990s and 15 years later still remain under its sanction.

#### Russian economic decline causes nuclear war

Filger 9

Sheldon Filger, founder of Global Economic Crisis, The Huffington Post. “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction”. 5/10/9. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis\_b\_201147.html

In Russia historically, economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation’s history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia’s economic crisis will endanger the nation’s political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama’s national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation’s nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

## \*\*\*AT Impact Turns\*\*\*

### JV Good—AT Weakness Turn

#### Repeal won’t be appeasement

Adamonis 3/15

Mark, 25-year old writer based in Washington DC who holds degrees in Russian studies from both Harvard and Oxford, It's Time to End the Jackson-Vanik Amendment, http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2012/03/15/its-time-to-end-the-jackson-vanik-amendment/

But in the hysterically ideological world of democracy promotion, things are quite a lot more complicated. As David Kramer, the head of Freedom House, said at an event sponsored by the Foreign Policy Initiative: “Politically, in light of the environment in Russia, which has been deteriorating, to simply lift Jackson-Vanik without some replacement would be viewed in Moscow and Russian leadership as a sign of weakness on the part of the United States — again, that we need this relationship more than they do. And if we don’t replace it, then we would, in their minds, be rewarding them despite their bad behavior by not going after them. To me, this has to be a package deal.” This is, to put it mildly, a rather curious mindset. Jackson-Vanik is a self evidently absurd law: if we’re going to keep it on the books we might as well have sanctions against Italy for its cruel occupation of Abyssinia or Japan for its misbehavior in Manchukuo. It is worth re-emphasizing, again, that Jackson-Vanik is designed to remedy a malady that no longer exists. The Soviet Union’s strict control over emigration is on history’s ash heap and Russian citizens are today perfectly free to emigrate if they so desire.\* How is it “weakness” to repeal a law that everyone, even hard-core Putin opponents like Garry Kasparov, Alexey Navalny, and Boris Nemtosv, agrees is absurd? How is it “weakness” to recognize that American interests are better served by sustained economic engagement with Russia as opposed to needless confrontation? How could normalized trade relations and marginally expanded bilateral economic activity, the results of Jackson-Vanik repeal, possibly weaken Russian civil society and the middle class which is increasingly an opponent of Putin and his regime?\*\* Rather than “weakness” the Obama administration’s decision to push for the repeal of Jackson-Vanik demonstrates an admirable clarity of purpose and an even more admirable willingness to ignore the opinions of people like David Kramer. Kramer has been opposed to the reset from the very beginning, and he never misses a chance to argue for a Russia policy that prominently features intransigent demands and hectoring lectures. Kramer wants tensions with Russia because, from his perspective, Russian interests are basically illegitimate. It’s thus not at all surprising to see that he is doing his very best to scuttle what could very easily be a win-win situation that would move the US Russian relationship onto a slightly stronger foundation.

### AT HR Impact Turns

#### Jackson Vanik is irrelevant to solve Human Rights concerns, other mechanisms solve.

**Borschchevskaya, 11**

Anna Borshchevskaya 12/16/11 “What's Next for Russia and Putin?“ is Assistant Director, Dinu Patriciu Eurasia Center at the Atlantic Council. http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2011/12/16/whats-next-for-russia-and-putin/#ixzz1iKsOy33R

The World Trade Organization (WTO) is expected to approve Russia’s bid for entry during its conference at the end of this week (December 15-17). While the United States can benefit from Russia’s WTO accession, it can only do so if it grants Russia normal trade relations status. This requires repealing the Jackson-Vanik Amendment which, since 1975, has required freedom of emigration in Russia in order for the United States to offer Russia most favored nation status— equal treatment in trade. Congress should repeal Jackson-Vanik, but embrace its spirit, and exert pressure on Russia to address its human rights problems through other mechanisms, and do this publically. This could include, for example, passage of legislation sanctioning senior Russian officials responsible for human rights abuses by freezing their U.S. assets, and publically naming these officials. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s call for full investigation after Russia’s Duma election results were announced, and her denunciation of the elections were “neither free nor fair” was the right response. A similar response should come from President Obama. Linking aid to human rights reform could be another tool. The United States has given Russia billions of dollars in aid since 1992 and continues aid in tens of millions each year. Jackson-Vanik was one of the most powerful "soft power" tools of the Cold war, and its success showed that human rights advocacy can advance U.S. interests; but Jackson-Vanik has lost much of its relevancy after the Cold War. Every U.S. president since Bill Clinton has supported repealing it, as Russia’s emigration policies had changed after the Cold War. The White House therefore regularly granted Russia a waiver from the Amendment’s provisions after an annual review, which certified that Russia meets minimal emigration standards. Today’s Russia is not the Soviet Union, and Russia no longer restricts the emigration of its citizens the way it did in the Soviet era. However, human rights are still poor in Russia—this has not improved since the Soviet era. The State Department’s annual human rights report criticizes the Russian government for severe corruption, torture, and lack of rule of law and due process. Russia continues to be one of the worst when it comes to press freedom.

#### Business benefits will trump congressional human rights concerns.

David C. Speedie 2/3/12 Russia Bulletin, Issue 2 February 3, 2012 http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/russia\_bulletin/00002

We've spoken of this before: the superannuated Cold War legislative relic that punished the Soviet Union for [a] being a non-free market economy and [b] restricting Jewish emigration. While both of these causes for sanction have manifestly disappeared (quite apart that the punitive measures now illogically apply to a different country, Russia) the Jackson-Vanik Amendment remains on the books, for unabashedly political, rather than economic reasons. What is remarkable here is that everyone on the political spectrum, from those to the left of the White House to arch-Cold warrior Richard Perle, agrees that Jackson-Vanik should be consigned to the rubbish heap of history. In one of the few references to Russia in his January 25 State of the Union address, President Obama called for "permanent normal trade relations with Russia," adding: "This Congress should make sure that no foreign company has an advantage over American manufacturing when it comes to accessing finance or new markets like Russia." So why the delay in doing the right thing? Ever alert to the possibilities for domestic political point scoring, some members of Congress are intent on playing the human rights card at Russia's expense. Thus, Jackson-Vanik repeal may be held hostage to a replacement law, as it were. This would be the Magnitsky Law, and would impose travel bans on Russian officials suspected of involvement in the mysterious death in prison of human rights lawyer Sergei Magnitsky. While one obviously hopes that this will be fully investigated-in, by, and for Russia-such questions arise as: Who are these officials? How wide is the net? And just a thought: if our elected representatives are thus stirred by human rights issues and their relation to trade, perhaps they should look into the case of Mr. Liu Xiaobo and seek similar sanctions on Chinese officials. In the end, Jackson-Vanik should be, and is, an economic, not a political issue. For this reason, the merits of the case must be argued by the business community and not be left entirely to our sage Congress. The U.S.-Russia Business Council has taken a welcome lead, enlisting such others as the Business Roundtable and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in a full-court press to put the issue before the key Congressional committees.

#### Chechen terrorism eradicated

Rotar ‘9

Igor Rotar, “Extremist Agony”, Defense and Security, August 5, 2009, LN

The latest terrorist acts smear the image of the stable Chechnya the authorities go to great length to create. Grozny itself has been built anew. These days, it is probably the nicest republican capital in all of the Caucasus. Construction of skyscrapers is under way. Highways are built all over Chechnya. In fact, the colossal sums the federal center invested in restoration of the republic are having their effect. It is a rare Chechen who supports separatists, these days. According to Shatoi District Intelligence Chief Yuri Shatun, gunmen nowadays number only about 120 men, no more, and their bases are located high in the mountains. Shatun called the terrorist acts "agony". "Backbone of resistance in Chechnya is broken. It is not going to be an exaggeration to say that Chechnya will soon become one of the most tranquil regions in the Caucasus. Unfortunately, this is no cause for joy because the war is shifting to the nearby republics of Dagestan and Ingushetia," Shatun said.

#### No nuclear terror short of a Russian invasion

Bale ‘4

Jeffrey M. Bale, Senior Research Associate, Monterey Institute of International Studies, James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, April 2004, http://www.nti.org/e\_research/e3\_47a.html

What, then, is the likelihood that Chechen fighters will carry out acts of radiological and nuclear terrorism, and which Chechens and/or foreign volunteers are most likely to do so? One potentially troubling scenario has been envisaged by Simon Saradzhyan. He believes that Chechen military leaders, perhaps irrespective of their ideological predispositions, might resort to carrying out radiological or (weapons of mass destruction) WMD attacks once they become sufficiently exasperated or desperate. Indeed, he seems to believe that they have already reached this state of mind.[23] According to this scheme, the most likely causative factor for future unconventional attacks would be the growing conviction among Chechen leaders like Basayev and Maskhadov that they will never be able to expel Russian troops through the use of conventional military tactics. In the absence of all other military options, they may therefore feel it necessary to up the ante. The problem with this scenario is that if they did so they would risk exposing themselves and indeed all of Chechnya to an unimaginably horrible retaliation by the Russians, possibly including an attack with tactical nuclear weapons. In the final analysis, how many Chechens would really be willing to risk total annihilation in order to hasten the departure of the Russians from their homeland? One could imagine them taking such a risky and extreme action if the Russians were already on the verge of annihilating them, but other than as an absolute last resort this scenario seems rather unlikely. One may object that the Russians were previously pressured to make concessions in the wake of high profile Chechen terrorist actions and military successes. After all, they agreed to negotiate with Basayev in Budennovsk and felt constrained to pull out of Chechnya following the sudden recapture of Groznyy by Maskhadov’s forces in 1996. On the other hand, the Russian government has adopted an even harder public line every time the Chechens have threatened to carry out acts of CBRN terrorism in Russian cities. Surely Basayev, who personally conveyed many of those threats, must be aware of how ineffective and counterproductive his prior nuclear and radiological blackmail efforts turned out to be. Any act of catastrophic terrorism on Russian soil by Chechens would likely infuriate the Russians and result in a devastating counterstrike against Chechnya, which may well suffice to dissuade normal Chechen patriots and nationalists from carrying out such an action.

## \*\*\*\*\*\*Aff\*\*\*\*\*\*

## \*\*\*Uniqueness\*\*\*

### Jackson-Vanik Won’t Pass

#### Jackson Vanik will not be repealed

[Ian Bremmer](http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/blog/2193), 6/21/12; Foreign Policy, “[Presidential campaign politics delays U.S. recognition of Russia at WTO](http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/21/presidential_campaign_politics_delays_us_recognition_of_russia_at_wto)”; Bremmer has a PhD in political science from Stanford, is president of Eurasia Group, Young Global Leader of the World Economic Forum, and spotlights for economics at various news agencies

While Russia will enter the WTO in late August, U.S. industry will be left on the sidelines until Congress removes the Cold War-era impediment to greater trade between the former foes. But it's a safe bet that Congress won't graduate Russia from the [Jackson-Vanik amendment](http://security.blogs.cnn.com/2012/06/21/u-s-could-feel-effects-of-amendment-meant-to-hurt-russia/), which is necessary to grant permanent normal trade relations to Russia and take advantage of its accession to the WTO, before the November election. The reason? Russia is perpetually steeped in controversy, and U.S.-Russia relations have become a campaign issue in the race between Republican Mitt Romney and President Barack Obama. U.S. industry likely won't be able to take advantage of greater market access in Russia until the lame-duck session at the end of the year, and possibly later. The White House is much more focused on November 6 (Election Day) than August 23 (the approximate date of Russia's WTO entry).

#### Russian arms sales to Syria could prevent Jackson-Vanik

Herb and Munoz 6/13

Jeremy Herb and Carlo Munoz, staffwriters for The Hill, 6/13/12, “OVERNIGHT DEFENSE: Syria alters US-Russia relations”, http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/army/232663-overnight-defense-syria-alters-us-russia-relations)

Outrage over a Russian sale of attack helicopters to Syria is being felt in Congress, where senators are placing holds on Defense Department employees and vowing consequences for Moscow if it continues to arm Syrian President Bashar al-Assad’s forces. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s accusation Tuesday that Russia had supplied Syria with attack helicopters quickly reverberated on Capitol Hill, where many senators are already up in arms about over what they say is inaction by the Obama administration to intervene in Syria. Sen. John Cornyn (R-Texas) placed a hold on the Army’s nominee to become top weapons buyer, Heidi Shyu, over the Pentagon’s contract with Russian arms company Rosoboronexport, which is also allegedly providing Syrian arms to Assad’s forces. Sen. Kelly Ayotte (R-N.H.) said in an MSNBC interview that President Obama should take a hard line with Russian President Vladmir Putin and make clear “there are going to be grave consequences to our relationship if they continue” to supply Syrian arms. The Obama administration has urged Russia to stop supporting Assad’s regime — Clinton’s charges Tuesday being the latest step — but so far the administration has not wanted to take actions outside of the United Nations Security Council, where Russia has vetoed most attempted actions. The administration has faced criticism from defense hawks in Congress for not supplying the Syrian opposition with arms or using airstrikes to establish a safe haven for the rebels. The Russian arms sale also has the potential to upend a trade deal with Russia to normalize trade relations before Russia joins the World Trade Organization.

#### **Jackson-Vanik won’t pass- concerns need to be addressed**

Reuters 6/12

(Doug Palmer, Reuters columnist, 6/12/12, “Senators pair Russia trade, human rights bills”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/12/us-usa-russia-trade-idUSBRE85B0W620120612)

But in a sign of trouble for what the White House has called its top trade priority this year, eight other Finance panel Republicans said Moscow's support for Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's government and a number of other concerns must be "satisfactorily" addressed before action on the trade bill. "Russia continues to support and enable the Assad regime in Syria through officially condoned arms sales and sustained opposition to United Nations Security Council resolutions, and continues to occupy the Democratic Republic of Georgia," Senator Orrin Hatch, the panel's top Republican, and seven colleagues said in a letter to Baucus. The Republican senators also expressed concern about Russia's commitment to human rights and the rule of law, its poor record of protecting intellectual property rights and a number of longstanding trade irritants that they feared would not be resolved by Moscow joining the WTO. Russia, the largest economy still outside the WTO, is expected to enter the Geneva-based trade body by the end of August. That has put pressure on Congress to establish PNTR by removing Russia from a 1974 law known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which conditions Russia's eligibility for the most favorable U.S. tariff rates on the rights of Russian Jews and religious minorities to emigrate freely. If Congress refuses, Russia could under world trade rules deny U.S. exporters some of the market-opening concessions it made to join the WTO. That would give other suppliers in Europe, Asia and Latin America a big advantage in the Russian market. Although Jewish emigration from Russia is no longer a problem, many members of Congress are reluctant to remove Russia from the old human rights legislation without passing a new law to address current human rights concerns. "The extension of Permanent Normal Trade Relations status and the repeal of the Jackson-Vanik amendment for Russia must be accompanied by passage of the Magnitsky Act," McCain said, referring to legislation already approved by the House of Representatives Foreign Relations Committee that would penalize Russian officials for human rights abuses.

#### Obama won’t spend political capital to repeal Jackson Vanik

[Ian Bremmer](http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/blog/2193), 6/21/12; Foreign Policy, “[Presidential campaign politics delays U.S. recognition of Russia at WTO](http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/21/presidential_campaign_politics_delays_us_recognition_of_russia_at_wto)”; Bremmer has a PhD in political science from Stanford, is president of Eurasia Group, Young Global Leader of the World Economic Forum, and spotlights for economics at various news agencies

The bill enjoys broad bipartisan support, with a number of lawmakers stating publicly that passage of the Magnitsky bill is a prerequisite for their vote on Jackson-Vanik. The Obama administration has sent contradictory messages about its support for the Magnitsky bill. While originally opposing the bill, the administration seems to have accepted the inevitable and has been working with its primary author, Democratic Sen. Ben Cardin of Maryland. One recent Senate version provides for the public list as well as a confidential annex, which would largely allow the administration to circumvent the thrust of the bill by invoking national security exemptions. This is strongly opposed by a number of senior lawmakers, including Sen. John McCain, who was a co-sponsor of the effort to repeal Jackson-Vanik on the caveat of corresponding passage of the Magnitsky bill. As the August recess rapidly approaches, the window for graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik prior to its WTO accession closes. Obama appears to have little room to maneuver in expending political capital on the matter without raising the risk of elevating Russia-and its collateral baggage including Syria, Georgia, Iran, and domestic protests-to a legitimate campaign issue. Unless Congress moves forward on its own prerogative-which appears unlikely-the repeal of Jackson-Vanik won't get passed before November, or later, leaving the world's largest economy unable to take advantage of the accession of the WTO's newest member.

#### **Jackson-Vanik won’t pass- Republicans won’t support it until their concerns of Russian policy are addressed**

Associated Press 6/12

(Fox News via Associated Press, 6/12/12, “Bill for normal trade with Russia meets opposition”, http://www.foxnews.com/us/2012/06/12/bill-for-normal-trade-with-russia-meets-opposition/#ixzz1z9ASNIc0)

A Senate plan to lift Cold War restrictions on trade with Russia drew immediate resistance from Senate Republicans who said Congress must first address Russia's poor human rights record and existing economic and political policies. Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus, D-Mont., on Tuesday introduced bipartisan legislation to normalize trade relations with Russia by repealing the 1974 Jackson-Vanik act that tied trade with the then-Soviet Union to Moscow's allowing Jews and other minorities to leave the country. The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is necessary if U.S. businesses are to enjoy the lower tariffs and increased access to Russian markets that will become available when Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer. Supporters of normalized trade said it could lead to a doubling of U.S. exports to Russia. "Jackson-Vanik served its purpose during the Cold War, but it's a relic of another era that now stands in the way of our farmers, ranchers and businesses pursuing opportunities to grow and create jobs," Baucus said in a statement. Baucus was joined in sponsoring the bill by Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman John Kerry, D-Mass., and Republicans John McCain of Arizona and John Thune of South Dakota. But eight Finance Committee Republicans, led by ranking Republican Orrin Hatch of Utah, wrote a letter to Baucus saying that Congress cannot ignore ongoing issues with Russia in moving to normalize trade relations. "Many aspects of the U.S.-Russia relationship are troubling," they said, naming the "flawed election and illegitimate regime of Vladimir Putin," the suppression of public protests, Russia's support for the Syrian government and its threats to attack U.S.-led NATO missile defense sites in Eastern Europe. The letter also raised Russia's theft of U.S. intellectual property and its pervasive problems with bribery and corruption and questioned whether Russia would comply if the WTO handed down adverse rulings on its economic policies. House Foreign Affairs Committee chairman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, R-Fla., on Tuesday, responding to reports that Russia was selling attack helicopters to Syria, said the administration's "string of concessions to Moscow must stop, including the latest effort to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment to give Russia preferential trade benefits." The GOP senators also warned against any weakening of human rights legislation now moving through both the House and the Senate and likely to be linked to repeal of Jackson-Vanik.

### PC Not Key

#### PC not key –the vote is ideological

The Hill 12

(Vicki Needham, correspondent for The Hill, 3/18/12, “Tensions over Syria could slow efforts to normalize Russia, U.S. trade relations”, http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/216549-tensions-over-syria-could-slow-legislation-to-normalize-russia-us-trade-relations)

Other lawmakers, however, are calling on the U.S. to stop doing business with Russia because they say the government is arming the Syrian regime of Bashir al-Assad with weapons that have been used to kill more than 8,000 civilians. "If you are going to subsidize the killing of innocent people we can no longer afford to do business with you," Senate Majority Whip Dick Durbin (D-Ill.) said on the floor Thursday. "I hope the Russians will understand, once and for all, that they can't play both sides of the street, and we in the United States should draw the line," he said. Durbin is part of a bipartisan group of 17 senators who sent a letter to Defense Secretary Leon Panetta urging the U.S. government to stop buying helicopters for the Afghan military from Rosoboronexport, a Russian firm that also exports weapons to Syria. In the past several years, the firm has been hit with U.S. sanctions for assisting Iran, he said. Still, businesses insist that without action, the United States will be left behind by the more than 150 other WTO nations that will jump at the chance to expand their businesses into Russia. "Passing PNTR with Jackson-Vanik legislation is Business Roundtable's (BRT) top legislative priority," David Thomas, vice president of public policy, with BRT, told The Hill. "The legislation is needed for U.S. companies and workers to compete selling their goods and services to Russia," he said. "Failure to pass a bill would "make it much more difficult for U.S. companies to compete with Russia against foreign competition." As part of the accession process Russia is required to lower tariffs, increase market access for foreign businesses and improve protections for intellectual property while the U.S. doesn't need to make any changes. "I would argue that giving Russia PNTR status … giving a chance for all of us to continue to move that country along will be a positive," Samuel Allen, chairman and chief executive, Deere & Co. said during a Senate Finance hearing Thursday. "And I think what a lot of people are not looking at right now is this is not just about growing jobs," Allen said. "They're going into the WTO. If we don't go with it, it's about losing jobs because our businesses are all going to go down vis-a-vis our competitors." While the senators acknowledge the importance for U.S. businesses in granting PNTR and eliminating Jackson-Vanik, which was used to urge Communist nations to improve human rights and emigration policies, they are questioning any change in policy that might appear to benefit Russia. The nation changed its rules on emigration more than 20 years ago and is in compliance. "Sure, we want to create jobs here in America," Sen. John Cornyn (R-Texas) said during the Finance hearing. "But at what point, whether it's corruption, whether it's enabling international terrorist states like Iran, whether it's arming thugs and murderers like President Assad in Syria do we say the cost is just too high in terms of sacrificing our basic values and protecting human rights?" On top of sending weapons to Syria, Russia also recently blocked an attempt by the U.N. Security Council to take action against the brutal crackdown on anti-government protestors by the Syrian regime. “Contrary to the administration’s assertions, Russia is moving further away from international norms and values," Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) said during Thursday's Finance panel hearing. Business leaders acknowledged the need to evaluate all the issues, including Syria, between now and June or July, when Russia is expected to vote on its agreement to join the WTO. "In the context of considering extending PNTR, it is the time to have a plan for tackling these other issues and to make sure that we are aligned in between the Congress and the administration," Alan Larson, chairman of the board, Transparency International USA, said during the Senate Finance hearing.

#### Ideology means Jackson-Vanik won’t be repealed—PC doesn’t work either and not top of the agenda.

RIA Novosti ‘12

Anti-Russian Amendment Now Headache for U.S., Factiva 3/8/12

Economic sanctions against Russia imposed by the United States in 1974 could backfire on America this year, but are likely to stay in place because of persistent political and ideological grudges between the two Cold War rivals, analysts said. The Jackson-Vanik amendment was defunct in practice over the last two decades, but things got tricky after Russia completed its 18-year-long path to the World Trade Organization (WTO) last year, with more than a little help from the White House. WTO rules ban formal trade restrictions such as the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which means the United States could face economic sanctions from Moscow and pressure from WTO once Russia completes the treaty's ratification, expected this summer. Elections First "Russia has no practical interest in canceling the Jackson-Vanik amendment," said Konstantin Kosachyov, a State Duma lawmaker with United Russia who is deputy head of the international affairs committee at the lower chamber. "Common sense predicts it will be canceled this summer. But it may become a hostage of the election campaign in the United States," Kosachyov said. The administration of U.S. President Barack Obama is making a push to have Congress formally repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment in regard to Russia, but this is unlikely to happen before the U.S. presidential elections in November, according to Russian and American pundits contacted by RIA Novosti. Kosachyov's prediction was echoed by Angela Stent of Georgetown University and Valery Garbuzov of the Russian Institute of the United States and Canada, both of whom said the Jackson-Vanik is expected to stay in place until the U.S. presidential elections. Obama has spoken against the amendment, a tool of the Cold War that denies Russia the status of permanent normal trade relations over the restriction on emigration of Soviet Jewry in the 1970s. “I have asked Congress to repeal Jackson-Vanik to make sure that all your companies and American companies all across the country can take advantage of it,” he said in March at a business roundtable in Washington, D.C. U.S. ambassador to Russia, Michael McFaul, has called repeal of the amendment a top priority for the White House this year. He has repeatedly spoken against Jackson-Vanik, including in an interview with Voice of America last week. The Obama administration could attempt swaying pro-Jackson-Vanik congressmen one by one or try to get the business lobby to convince the legislators of the damages U.S. businesses faces in Russia over the amendment, Garbuzov said. But neither strategy would yield fast results, he said.

#### No repeal and PC not key

Herrera ‘11 – Professor of Political Science @ Wisconsin-Madison

Yoshiko, “10/27/11 Jackson-Vanik Amendment will live on,” http://valdaiclub.com/usa/33561.html

As is well known, the Jackson-Vanik amendment is outdated. It was intended to address the issue of restrictions on Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union in the 1970s by denying "most favored nation" status to the USSR and other communist countries that restricted Jewish emigration. The amendment was added to Title IV of the 1974 U.S. Trade Act and remains in force today, although the President of the U.S. can grant a yearly waiver. It is not possible for the law today to serve its original purpose because the USSR no longer exists, and Jewish emigration is no longer subject to the restrictions that inspired the law. It would seem obvious then that the law should be repealed. Indeed with the "reset" of U.S.-Russian relations by the Obama administration and the call for the repeal of the law by Vice President Joseph Biden in March 2011, it seemed like repeal was imminent, but so far nothing has changed. Upon closer inspection, the failure to repeal Jackson-Vanik should come as no surprise. Over the years, Jackson-Vanik has come to be viewed as an inexhaustible source of leverage against Russia, a bargaining chip to be forever promised but never actually cashed in. Whenever someone wants Russia to do something, the law is held up as a quid pro quo, where if Russia were to do X, then Jackson-Vanik would be repealed. Despite whatever is done on the Soviet or Russian side, however, the law is mysteriously never repealed. The most obvious case for its repeal came when Mikhail Gorbachev lifted restrictions on Jewish emmigration during the late 1980s; the end of the USSR in 1991 was another prime moment for repeal. In the 1990s, Jackson-Vanik was repeatedly held up as a bargaining chip. At this point it is safe to say that Jackson-Vanik no longer can be connected to any real situation on the ground in Russia. For this reason it is a mistake to look to something that is actually happening in Russia in order to understand the law's persistence. It does not matter if Putin becomes President of Russia again in 2012. The repeal of Jackson-Vanik will be a function of U.S. politics, not Russian policy or politics. Politics in the U.S. right now, however, is neither particularly rational nor strategic. The Congress is beset by bitter partisan gridlock, where success is no longer measured in terms of any positive legislative achievements. The bar has sunk so low that merely passing a continuing resolution to keep the government from entirely shutting down is a major legislative victory. In this environment who is thinking long term? Who is asking whether laws make sense, or whether they serve their intended purposes? The answer is that while there are some dedicated, intelligent, and competent members of the U.S. Congress, the institution as a whole is not functioning particularly well at present, and it is a mistake therefore to expect that the U.S. Congress will pass or repeal laws on the basis of a law's strategic value (e.g. Jackson-Vanik's role in U.S.-Russia relations). In addition, beyond the U.S. Congress, President Obama has other more pressing matters to attend to, including a recession, an election, and the specter of a catastrophic failure in congressional approval of budget appropriations this fall. Taking the U.S. political landscape into account, we can conclude that regardless of the merits of repealing Jackson-Vanik, and regardless of anything that happens in Russia, we should expect that unless the situation in the U.S. Congress changes, Jackson-Vanik will live on.

### Not Top of Agenda

**No vote until after the election.**

Mizulin et all 6-11.

[Nikolay, int’l and EU trade law lawyer, Partner @ Mayer & Brown law firm, “Russian Federation: The Russian Government finally submits WTO accession protocol to Russian Parliament” Mondaq -- http://www.mondaq.com/x/181432/International+Trade/The+Russian+Government+Finally+Submits+WTO+Accession+Protocol+To+Russian+Parliament]

Thus, for the United States to receive the benefits of many of4 the accession agreement that Russia negotiated with WTO members, the US **Congress must** affirmatively **act to change US law prior to the time that Russia becomes a member of the WTO**. However, **while there is a small chance the Congress will enact a bill to repeal Jackson-Vanik this summe**r or fall, **it is more likely to occur after the US election in November.**

### Transportation Bill Thumper

#### Congress passed a massive transportation bill

RTTNews 6/29

"Congress Passes Transportation, Student Loan Rate Bill," 6/29/12 [www.rttnews.com/1915066/congress-passes-transportation-student-loan-rate-bill.aspx?type=usp&pageNum=1](http://www.rttnews.com/1915066/congress-passes-transportation-student-loan-rate-bill.aspx?type=usp&pageNum=1) AD 6/29/12

(RTTNews) - In an unusual show of bipartisan compromise and agreement, the Congress passed a bill Friday designating additional funds to highway and transport infrastructure, halting a hike of student loan interest rates and shoring up federal flood protection programs. The bill, which passed 74-19 in the Senate Friday afternoon, approves a $120 billion, 27-month package to fund highway and transport projects and also preserves a 3.4 percent cap on Stafford student loan interest rates. The bill also extends the federal flood insurance program. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., hailed the passage Friday, saying, "This legislation proves that when Republicans decide to work with Democrats, we can do a lot to move our economy forward."

#### The transportation bill was enormous and popular

AP 6/29

"Congress passes student loans, highway jobs bill," Alan Fram and Joan Lowy 6/29/12 [www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2012/06/29/house\_passes\_student\_loans\_highway\_jobs\_bill/?page=2](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2012/06/29/house_passes_student_loans_highway_jobs_bill/?page=2) AD 6/29/12

WASHINGTON—Congress emphatically approved legislation Friday preserving jobs on transportation projects from coast to coast and avoiding interest rate increases on new loans to millions of college students, giving lawmakers campaign-season bragging rights on what may be their biggest economic achievement before the November elections. The bill sent for President Barack Obama's signature enables just over $100 billion to be spent on highway, mass transit and other transportation programs over the next two years, projects that would have expired Saturday without congressional action. It also ends a bare-knuckle political battle over student loans that raged since spring, a proxy fight over which party was best helping voters muddle through the economic downturn. Obama signed a one-week temporary measure Friday evening, permitting the highway and loan programs to continue until the full legislation reaches his desk.

#### It was new spending

AP 6/29

"Congress passes student loans, highway jobs bill," Alan Fram and Joan Lowy 6/29/12 [www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2012/06/29/house\_passes\_student\_loans\_highway\_jobs\_bill/?page=2](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2012/06/29/house_passes_student_loans_highway_jobs_bill/?page=2) AD 6/29/12

Most of the overall measure was financed by extending federal taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel for two more years. Those levies, unchanged for nearly two decades, are 18.4 cents a gallon for gasoline and 24.4 cents for diesel and now fall well short of fully financing highway programs, which they were designed to do. About $20 billion would be raised over the next decade by reducing tax deductions for companies' pension contributions and increasing the fees they pay to federally insure their pension plans. In return, a formula was changed to, in effect, let companies apportion less money for their pensions and to provide less year-to-year variation in those amounts. To raise other revenue, the government will start charging interest on subsidized Stafford loans no more than six years after undergraduates begin their studies. Today no interest is charged until after graduation, no matter how long that takes. In addition, a loophole was tightened to make it harder for businesses with roll-your-own cigarette machines to classify the tobacco they sell as pipe tobacco -- which is taxed at a lower rate than cigarette tobacco. The change is expected to raise nearly $100 million.

## \*\*\*Aff Magnitsky\*\*\*

### **Magnitsky hurts relations**

#### Magnitsky passed the Senate committee—will be attached to the PNTR bill and will destroy relations

Rogin 6/26

Josh Rogin overs national security and foreign policy and writes the daily Web column The Cable 06/26/12 http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/26/senate\_panel\_approves\_magnitsky\_bill\_unanimously

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has approved a bill to sanction human rights violators around the world, named after Sergei Magnitsky, the Russian anti-corruption lawyer who died after allegedly being tortured in prison by Russian officials. The Cable has obtained the latest draft of [the Senate version](http://www.scribd.com/doc/98334258/MRW12157) of the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Act of 2012, which passed the committee unanimously Tuesday afternoon by a voice vote after a short debate. The bill imposes restrictions on the financial activities and travel of foreign officials found to have been connected to various human rights violations in any country. [The House version of the bill](http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/06/07/magnitsky_bill_moves_forward_in_the_house), approved by the House Foreign Affairs Committee earlier this month, targets only Russian human rights violators. That difference that will have to be worked out between the two chambers before the bill can become law. "This bill is absolutely motivated by the circumstances of Sergei Magnitsky, but it is universal in its application," said Sen. Ben Cardin (D-MD), the main sponsor of the bill, after the vote. "The sponsors of the House bill have encouraged me to keep it universal, so I think it will not be difficult to get the House to go along with the universality." The de-emphasis of Russia in the bill is ostensibly meant to tamp down Russian anger over the legislation. The Russian government has promised widespread retaliation, saying that passage of the Magnitsky Act could negatively affect Russian cooperation with Washington on issues ranging from Afghanistan and Iran to nuclear weapons. Cardin said the bill will now be joined with legislation introduced earlier this month to grant Russia Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status, needed so that U.S. businesses can take advantage of Russia's pending accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO). The PNTR bill introduced by Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-MT) earlier this month and co-sponsored by Sen. John McCain (R-AZ) would also repeal the 1974 Jackson-Vanik law that sanctioned the Soviet Union for denying Jews the right to emigrate. "When PNTR comes to the floor, that's the driving force behind the timing [of passing the Magnitsky bill in the full Senate]," Cardin said. He added that if it was done in July that would also coincide with pending action by the Russian Duma to formally join the WTO. Whether Baucus would join the two bills in his committee or on the Senate floor is still unclear. The bulk of the debate inside Tuesday's SFRC business meeting focused on Cardin's amendment to adjust the way the list of names of human rights violators is managed. [Cardin's amendment](http://www.scribd.com/doc/98335945/05-Cardin-Amendment) would impose some more requirements on the administration if it wants to keep the names of the human rights violated secret in a classified annex, rather than publish them publicly. SFRC Chairman John Kerry (D-MA) was the lone vote against the Cardin amendment and unsuccessfully tried to get Cardin to withdraw the amendment during the hearing. He is working to preserve more administration flexibility in administrating the classified list of human rights violators and said that there would be more changes in the bill before it reaches the Senate floor.

#### Obama won’t veto Magnitsky—will be attached to the final bill

Solash 6/28

Richard Solash Correspondent at Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty 06/28/12 http://www.rferl.org/content/us-senate-vote-magnitsky-bill-russia-trade/24627033.html

Veto Not Expected From there, analysts say Obama is not expected to veto the bill. Passage of the Magnitsky legislation has become tied in Congress to repealing the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik Amendment, a step needed to grant Russia permanent normalized trade relations with the United States. The Obama administration has pushed for the move, without which Washington will be at a disadvantage upon Russia's upcoming entry into the World Trade Organization. "To some extent [the advancement of the Magnitsky bill] is a blow to the Obama administration," said Andrew Kuchins of the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington. "They had certainly opposed the Magnitsky legislation earlier this year, but the writing on the wall in the spring seemed very, very clear -- that there was no way that permanent normal trade relations status for Russia was going to go through without some version of the Magnitsky legislation going forward as well. So I think they have simply had to accept reality." Kerry, meanwhile, said he "does not view [the Magnitsky bill] as a completely finished product," suggesting that provisions of the bill could change before the full Congress considers it, expected later this summer. Should the legislation become codified as U.S. law, it is expected to act as a precedent for other Western parliaments to adopt similar measures.

#### Russia dislikes Magnitsky amendment—Russia not punishing US for gitmo

RIA Novosti, 6/27

(RIA Novosti, Russia's leading multimedia news agency, June 27, 2012, “Russia Warns U.S. Over Magnitsky Bill Response”, http://en.ria.ru/world/20120627/174264305.html)

Russia called on the United States on Wednesday to weigh the possible consequences of approving a bill penalizing Russian officials for human rights abuses. "[They have] an opportunity to weigh the consequences after all, so we urge our U.S. partners and U.S. lawmakers to do just that," Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov told reporters in Moscow. Pro-Kremlin parliamentarian Vyacheslav Nikonov suggested Russia should introduce a Guantanamo list or Viktor Bout list, referring to U.S. officials linked to the alleged abuse suffered by inmates at the Guantanamo Bay prison or the jailing of the convicted Russian arms dealer.

#### Magnitsky will pass

Baker, 6/26

(Peter Baker, White House correspondent, June 26, 2012, The New York Times, “Senate Panel Backs Punishing Russians on Human Rights Violations”, http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/26/senate-panel-backs-punishing-russians-on-human-rights-violations/)

Senators of both parties rebuffed President Obama and advanced legislation on Tuesday intended to punish Russian human rights violators despite concern by the White House that it would further complicate already souring relations with Moscow. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee passed the bill unanimously, less than two weeks after its House counterpart approved a similar measure. The momentum in both houses means the new sanctions included in the legislation have a chance of becoming law but its fate may be tied to a parallel measure intended to drop decades-old trade restrictions on Russia. The bill, the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act, is named for a Russian lawyer who died in prison after attempting to investigate official corruption. His death has become a rallying point both in Moscow and in Washington for those critical of the government of President Vladimir V. Putin. The bill would block visas and freeze assets of those implicated in human rights abuses.

#### Magnitsky will hurt relations- Russian Presidential Aide warns Russia will take offense

Nikolskiy 6/17

(Aleksei Nikolskiy, staffwriter for RIA Novotsi a Russian newspaper, 6/17/12,

“Kremlin: Replacement of Jackson-Vanik with Magnitsky Bill Unacceptable”, http://en.ria.ru/russia/20120617/174086727.html)

Moscow has warned the U.S. Administration that replacement of Jackson-Vanik Amendment with Magnitsky blacklist is 'unacceptable', Russian Presidential Aide Yuri Ushakov said on Sunday. A group of influential U.S. senators, including former Republican presidential candidate, John McCain, proposed in mid-March to introduce a blacklist of Russian officials allegedly linked to Hermitage Capital lawyer Magnitsky’s death, in a Moscow pre-trial detention center in November 2009, in exchange for the cancellation of the Jackson-Vanik amendment. The amendment limits trade with Russia and is an obstacle to the application of World Trade Organization (WTO) rules between the two countries. The restrictions imposed by Jackson-Vanik are often waived, but remain in place and are a thorn in the side of Russia-U.S. trade relations. “We’ve warned the U.S. administration that replacement of Jackson-Vanik with Magnitsky bill is unacceptable,” Ushakov said ahead of a meeting between the Russian president and his U.S. colleague that will be held at the sidelines of the upcoming G8 summit in Los Cabos. The projected Magnitsky bill is an ostentatious anti-Russian move and if this bill is passed Russia will introduce retaliatory measures, Ushakov continued. “Many countries… deny entry to undesirable persons. This is done not publicly and is a common diplomatic practice. But now the issue is about an ostentatious anti-Russian move, they [the congress] are trying to assign an expanded value to the bill, first of all, to use this law when the U.S. is dissatisfied with Russia,” Ushakov said. “Everybody understands that it [the Magnitsky blacklist] is a negative element in the bilateral ties. Everybody understands that retaliatory Russian measures would be inevitable, but we would like to avoid them,” he added. Magnitsky was arrested on tax evasion charges in November 2008, just days after accusing police investigators in a $230 million tax refund fraud, and died after almost a year in the Matrosskaya Tishina pre-trial detention center in Moscow.

#### **Newly approved Magnitsky has bipartisan support- will hurt relations**

RT News 6/27

(RT News, 6/27/12, “US Senate panel approves Magnitsky bill”, http://www.rt.com/news/senate-magnitsky-bill-russia-832/)

In yet another blow to US-Russian relations the US Senate committee has unanimously approved a bill imposing travel and economic sanctions against Russian officials over the 2009 death of the lawyer Sergey Magnitsky. The Sergey Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act comes despite congressional efforts to lift the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik amendment restricting trade with Russia. The bill, which was approved on Tuesday by the Foreign Relations Committee, would impose visa bans and asset freezes on Russians that the US accuses of human rights violations. Specifically it targets those linked to the death of the Hermitage Capital lawyer Sergey Magnitsky, who died following mistreatment in custody in 2009. Moscow has strongly objected to the legislation and has warned of retaliatory measures if it becomes law. Russia views the Magnitsky list as interference in its internal affairs. Despite the Obama administration’s efforts to reset US-Russian relations, the draft enjoys strong support from both the Republicans and the Democrats. “This bill is universal,” Senator Benjamin Cardin, Democrat from Maryland, who sponsored the bill said after the vote. “It's absolutely motivated by Sergey Magnitsky, but it's universal in its application.” A similar bill was passed by a House of Representatives committee earlier this month. The act has yet to be voted on in the full House, and will come into force only once President Obama has signed it. The US has already barred several dozen Russian officials allegedly implicated in the death of the lawyer from the entering the country. Moscow responded last year by taking similar action against US officials accused of human rights violations. If passed, the bill will replace the outdated Jackson-Vanik amendment passed in 1974, which barred favorable trade relations with the Soviet Union because it wouldn’t allow Jews to leave the country. The repeal of Jackson-Vanik is necessary if US businesses want greater access to the Russian markets as Russia joins the World Trade Organization this summer. There is clearly politicization of this process given that it’s coming at this time when President Obama is firmly on track to attempt to reset US-Russian relations, Daniel Wagner, CEO at Country Risk Solutions, told RT. “It’s becoming more difficult for him to try to achieve that with everything else that’s going on in the world.” If this bill is passed, Russia and the United States could be in for a rocky period and could face misunderstandings and very negative attitudes on both sides, warns Martin Sieff, chief global analyst at The Globalist magazine. “This is a very irrational as well as an irresponsible measure. In practice it has nothing to do with Magnitsky,” he told RT. He also insisted the passing of the bill would certainly harm US interests. “The need for security and law and order cooperation between the United States and Russia is absolutely pre-eminent in the world,” he stated, adding that the two countries are the two great thermonuclear powers in the world and had considerable strategic interests and concerns in common.

## \*\*\*Aff Relations Mechanics\*\*\*

### Alt Cause to Relations

#### **US-Russia relations are strained—Putin prevents improvement**

Anniston Star 6/22

(The Editorial Board of the Anniston Star, newspaper, “Cool times between friends: Relations between U.S., Russia sign of nations’ many differences”, 6/22/12, http://www.annistonstar.com/view/full\_story/19068530/article-Cool-times-between-friends--Relations-between-U-S--Russia-sign-of-nations%E2%80%99-many-differences?instance=home\_opinion)

The Obama-Putin meeting in Mexico solidified what already was clear: the days of improved relationships with Russia ended with the election-day defeat of former President Dmitry Medvedev. Putin, a former KGB man, has returned to the presidency after a term as prime minister, where he not so quietly bided his time and affected Medvedev’s Russian policy. This isn’t merely the case of two powerful nations that wield competing worldviews. These are nations that harbor serious disagreements over several issues, including how best to stem the bloodshed in Syria, where activists say more than 14,000 people have died since March 2011. Before this week’s meetings, the White House had wisely called for the ouster of Syrian President Bashir Assad. Russia, a Syrian ally, has disagreed; publicly, Putin has said only Syrians have the right to decide Assad’s fate. Following the G-20 summit, Obama delivered an altered view by describing Assad’s situation as a “political process,” even though concerns remain about the possibility of Assad’s forces using Russian arms against Syrian civilians. The U.S.-Russia relations also are strained over the deployment of the U.S. missile-defense system and recent State Department comments unkind to Putin’s presidential victory. That said, Putin’s hard-line approach and Soviet-style coolness to U.S. policies may make it impossible for relations to warm between our country and his while he’s president. This week’s pictures show these aren’t two nations standing in unison. For now, they’re putting up with each other, and even that is a struggle.

#### US-Russia relations low- Putin’s policies indicate Russia’s disinterest in pursuing US relations

Minchev 6/28

(Ognyan Minchev, staffwriter for Public Service Europe, dedicated to analysis of foreign affairs, 28 June 2012 “Putin relishes deteriorating US-Russia relations”, http://www.publicserviceeurope.com/article/2144/putin-relishes-deteriorating-us-russia-relations#ixzz1z7hNSJwb)

President Obama's attempt to reset relations with Russia has failed, possibly leading to an extended divergence between the two powers – a development apparently welcomed by Vladimir Putin The meeting of United States President Barack Obama and his Russian counterpart Vladimir Putin at the G20 summit in Mexico only underscored the chill in relations between Moscow and Washington. In fact, relations have deteriorated steadily since Putin replaced the ailing Boris Yeltsin in 1999, despite Obama's ambitious program to improve – or 'reset' – bilateral ties. Today the reset is over, and the two leaders no longer disguise their differences on most important international issues. For Obama, the interment of one of his administration's signature foreign policy efforts at the outset of a re-election campaign is an unwelcome realisation. With few triumphs in the international arena, Obama undoubtedly looked forward to citing improved relations with Russia as an unqualified asset. For their part, Russian leaders have seemed contemptuous of American hopes for renewing their strained relationship. Under Putin, Moscow has steadfastly opposed western efforts to halt civilian casualties in Syria and international efforts to block Iran's nuclear program. Most pointedly, the new US ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul – a key author of the reset strategy – was publicly ostracized in a series of Russian media exposés. Clearly, Putin and his government welcome the rapidly deteriorating US-Russia relationship. Some of the interests underlying Moscow's strategy appear obvious. For example, Russia rejected the establishment of a North Atlantic Treaty Organisation anti-missile defence shield over Europe, perceiving it as a threat. Western and US policies meant to encourage the Arab spring revolutions struck Russian authorities as part of a conspiracy aimed at – among other things – hampering Russian interests in places like Libya and Syria. Moscow sees US-led efforts to curb Tehran's nuclear programme as an attempt to provoke western or Israeli military action, with the aim of effecting regime change. This could pave the way for the US and its allies to strategically and commercially penetrate post-Soviet central Asia. The west's direct access to central Asian energy resources could cripple Russia's strategy of monopolising energy supply corridors between Europe and the east.

#### **US-Russia Relations stagnant- opposition about Syria**

Rueters 6/13

(Matt Spetalnick and Steve Gutterman, 6/13/12, “Syria puts stress on US-Russia ties on eve of Obama-Putin talks”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/13/us-usa-russia-obama-putin-idUSBRE85C1SZ20120613)

An escalating crisis in Syria, echoing with Cold War-style recriminations, has badly frayed U.S.-Russian relations at a delicate time, just as U.S. President Barack Obama and Russian President Vladimir Putin try to renew their relationship. U.S. charges that Russia is arming the Syrian government as it attacks its opponents with lethal force, and Moscow's blocking of tougher action against Damascus, appear to indicate that tough times are ahead for Putin's relationship with Obama and, perhaps, his successor. The fiercely nationalist Putin, who re-assumed the Russian presidency last month, is due to meet Obama at a G20 summit in Mexico early next week, their first encounter in three years. There is growing skepticism the two men can find common ground on Syria or other festering disputes. Obama has touted the "reset" of relations with Russia, which came during the term of Putin predecessor Dmitry Medvedev, as one of his signature foreign policy achievements. But Washington finds itself increasingly at odds with Moscow on issues from Syria and Iran to missile defense and human rights. Putin shows no sign of backing away from the anti-Western rhetoric and positions that have long been his hallmark. That could set the stage for an uncomfortable meeting in Los Cabos, Mexico. "The point is to break the ice, score a few political points but not have any kind of diplomatic blow-up in the process," said Matthew Rodansky, a Washington-based Russia expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

#### **US-Russia relations cooling- Putin blocks US interests**

Reuters 6/13

(Matt Spetalnick and Steve Gutterman, 6/13/12, “Syria puts stress on US-Russia ties on eve of Obama-Putin talks”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/13/us-usa-russia-obama-putin-idUSBRE85C1SZ20120613)

For nearly an hour, Putin ticked off a long list of Russian complaints almost without interruption, touching on everything from missile defense to the U.S. invasion of Iraq to perceived missteps in the post-September 11 fight against Islamist militancy. Obama listened patiently and when Putin's monologue was over he asked that they extend the meeting and work to find a path toward improved relations. The warming trend set in motion during Obama's Russia trip three years ago has since run its course. But White House deputy national security adviser Ben Rhodes dismissed the notion that Putin's hardened rhetoric signaled a desire to reverse the diplomatic gains of the reset, suggesting instead that he was playing to his political base. "Putin was speaking to that streak of Russian nationalism that's very much in line with his political identity," Rhodes said in a recent interview. But strains have deepened as NATO pushes ahead with missile defense in Europe, which Putin says would hurt Russia's strategic deterrence despite Washington's assertion that it is meant to protect against an Iranian missile threat.

#### **Putin takes steps to damage US-Russia relations- snubs Obama**

Reuters 6/22

(Timothy Heritage, staffwriter, 6/22/12, “Russia's Putin: Who does he want to be in new term?”, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/22/us-russia-putin-idUSBRE85L0WG20120622)

Putin's meeting with Obama on the sidelines of the G20 summit in Mexico was widely seen as evidence that the return of the hawkish Putin to replace Dmitry Medvedev, his more liberal protege, would end the "reset" in Russian-U.S. relations. U.S. officials said this was a superficial impression. But there was no avoiding the contrast with the friendliness at meetings between Putin and Obama's predecessor, George W. Bush, which became known as "The George and Vladimir Show". Putin, 59, has also been to China, France, Germany, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan since his inauguration on May 7. The choice of Minsk as his first destination sent a shock wave through the diplomatic community. Putin had pulled out of a meeting of the Group of Eight industrial powers in the United States and Belarus is led by Alexander Lukashenko, who has been described as Europe's last dictator. The decision sent a warning to the West - and a powerful signal to his domestic audience - that Putin was ready to snub Washington to show the importance of ties with a traditional ally that was once part of the Soviet empire. He also went to Beijing to strengthen economic and defense ties before meeting Obama, suggesting Russia is now looking eastward more than westward for its economic development. "The choice of where to go was very symbolic. You don't do such things by accident," said a diplomat based in Moscow. Such grandstanding is typical of Putin and diplomats say he is not above a bit of one-upmanship to get a psychological advantage over his U.S. or European counterparts.

#### Relations low and alt causes

Clover 12

Charles, “End is nigh for Russia’s ‘reset’ with US,” Financial Times, 1/2/2012. http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/f406272a-3546-11e1-84b9-00144feabdc0.html?ftcamp=rss#axzz1kD0U4XxV

Almost as soon as Russia and the US declared a “reset” in their relations in 2009, there were warnings that the thaw was already over. This time, however, it seems the end really is nigh. With the almost assured return of Vladimir Putin to the Russian presidency in March elections, and the outbreak of street protests against election fraud in Moscow and other Russian cities in December, US politicians are distancing themselves from the soft line on Russia peddled by the White House for two and a half years. The reset was based partly on good personal chemistry between Barack Obama, the US president, and Dmitry Medvedev, the Russian president – a comparatively pro-western and liberal politician who took over from Mr Putin, his political mentor, in 2008. However, in September the two announced that they would switch jobs, and the hawkish Mr Putin would return to the presidency. Putin has announced the creation of a “Eurasian Union” with Kazakhstan and Belarus by 2013 – an idea that has produced nervousness in Washington that he, despite firm denials, intends to create something akin to the Soviet Union in central Asia and eastern Europe. Last week, Aleksei Pushkov, a senior foreign affairs commentator recently named chairman of the foreign affairs committee in the state Duma, said the reset had been “cancelled” in an interview with the Vedomosti newspaper. He said Mr Putin was the “embodiment of the idea of Russia as a global power centre and the centre of the Eurasian Union”. The US finds this unacceptable, Mr Pushkov said. Publicly, at least, Washington insists that it seeks a constructive relationship with Russia, regardless of who the president is. The period of the reset has seen some breakthroughs in bilateral co-operation, such as the April 2010 signing of the New Start treaty on reducing nuclear armaments, and an agreement, reached in November 2010, for Nato to deliver supplies to Afghanistan across Russian territory. Russia became a member of the World Trade Organisation last month. In practice, it is clear that the imminent return of Mr Putin has changed the tone and shortened fuses on both sides. This has become especially obvious following the eruption of street protests over December’s elections. Hillary Clinton, US secretary of state, took a tough line with Moscow on the blatantly rigged polls for the state Duma, or lower house or parliament. “We’ve just witnessed a flawed Duma election in Russia,” said Mrs Clinton on a December trip to Lithuania, hitting back at Russian pressure on Golos – an independent election monitoring organisation, whose members were targeted in an apparently officially sanctioned harassment campaign. That provoked a furious row, with Mr Putin accusing Mrs Clinton of “sending signals” to Russia’s opposition. He said political opponents were being “used” by unnamed foreign states in a televised phone-in show. In Washington, the return of Mr Putin has put wind in the sails of the “Magnitsky act”, a proposal circulating through US Congress aimed at barring Russian officials linked to corruption and human rights abuses from entering the US. Relations have soured on other fronts. The US pursuit of an anti-ballistic missile system in Europe, ostensibly aimed at Iran, has provoked a furious response from the Kremlin. The original “reset” was based partly on the White House rejection of a previous ABM system sought by George W. Bush. Now the Kremlin has made clear that the new system is also unacceptable. Cliff Kupchan, Russia expert at the Eurasia Group, the political risk consultancy, said the US and Russia had too much at stake to abandon detente. “Reset isn’t over but it is in danger”. For the US, Russian help, or at least lack of obstruction, still matters on Iran and Afghanistan, he noted. But with both countries entering presidential election cycles, there is little incentive for either side to take big steps toward reconciliation.

**Tensions in US Russian relations inevitable.**

**Pifer 12**. [Steven, Senior Fellow @ Brookings, “The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship” Brookings Institute -- March 21 -- http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2012/0321\_arms\_control\_pifer.aspx]

**U.S. and Russian interests differ in the post-Soviet space**, the region that is most likely to generate a major crisis in bilateral relations. Moscow seeks to gain influence over its neighbors, using mechanisms such as the Customs Union with Kazakhstan and Belarus. The Russians seek deference from other states in the post-Soviet space on issues that they define as affecting critical Russian interests. **One example is staunch Russian opposition to the enlargement of NATO or the E**uropean **U**nion into the post-Soviet space. Russian policies often seem to have the effect of pushing neighboring states away from Moscow, but **the Russians have not changed course. The U**nited **S**tates takes a different approach**, rejecting the notion of a sphere of influence** and supporting the right of each post-Soviet state to choose its own course. Some **tension between the two approaches is inevitable. Washington should expect the kinds of tit-for-tat exchanges that have occurred in the past**, such as when a U.S. Navy ship visit to Georgia was followed by a Russian warship calling on Venezuela. Given the difference in approaches, it would be wise for Washington and Moscow to consult closely and be transparent with one another on their policies in the post-Soviet space, so as to avoid surprises and minimize the chances that a clash of interests could escalate. **One other difficult issue is the democracy and human rights situation within Russia**. While Russian citizens today enjoy considerably more individual freedoms than they did during the time of the Soviet Union, it is equally true that they enjoy fewer freedoms, are more subject to arbitrary and capricious state action, and have less political influence than during the 1990s, however chaotic that period was.

### AT: Repeal k/t Relations

#### Jackson-Vanik is irrelevant to relations – ignores lack of expanded economic and trade ties and conflicts over BMD.

Ivanov ‘11

Eugene Ivanov. April 13, 2011. “Looking beyond the reset”. Russia Beyond the Headlines. http://rbth.ru/articles/2011/04/13/looking\_beyond\_the\_reset\_12690.html

Equally important, the “reset” has changed the very tone of U.S.-Russia dialogue and created conditions for its further advancement. As pointed out by Robert Legvold, a prominent Russia expert from Columbia University, the reset can be considered a success if only because there are now expectations of further progress in U.S.-Russia relations. It is time now to view the reset not as an end in itself, but, rather, as a mean to advance an agenda in U.S.-Russia relations for the next 10-15 years. To create such an agenda won’t be easy. The Cold War might be officially over, but fighting its ghosts is still a popular business on both sides. Although the emotional disdain many folks in Moscow harbor towards the notorious Jackson-Vanik amendment is understandable, focusing too much attention on its repeal is a distraction: A relic of the past that long outlived its usefulness, the amendment, as it legally stands, is completely irrelevant. Moreover, some analysts even argue that the emphasis on arms control—the principal topic of the Moscow-Washington dialogue in the Cold War era and since—distorts and, ultimately, slows down U.S.-Russia relations by shifting attention and energy from other critical issues. In this regard, it’s worth noting that the only think tank in Russia that is fully devoted to the topic of U.S.-Russia relations, the Institute for the U.S. and Canadian Studies, specializes precisely in the area of arms control. Russia would definitely benefit from developing additional, more diverse, intellectual resources to deal with the whole spectrum of relations. Currently, two topics dominate the U.S.-Russia agenda: Russia’s accession to the WTO and the architecture of European anti-missile defense. While, again, Moscow’s frustration over the seemingly endless process of its WTO negotiations with Washington is understandable, the issue of WTO accession, completely tactical in nature, should not deflect attention from a much more serious problem: the anemic state of U.S.-Russia economic and trade cooperation. Any future strategic discussion must focus on what prevents both countries from investing in each other’s economies (beyond the current meager $7-8 billion per year) or diversifying their trade (beyond energy and metal industry sectors). The importance of the economic component of U.S.-Russia relations is impossible to overestimate. In fact, until and unless the relations are based on a solid economic foundation, there will always be a chance that a “bad” event could throw them back to a “pre-reset” misery. At the moment, the best candidate for such a “bad” event is a collapse of Russia-NATO negotiations over European missile defense. True, the disagreements between the two sides are fundamental in nature. Yet, it is also true that today no one expects the negotiating parties to agree on every minute, technical aspect of the future ABM system. What is really needed is a political decision to cooperate, a decision that can be formulated in language that would be palatable to domestic hawks on both sides of the Atlantic. This is doable, and this must be done, for the cost of not doing so will be too high for both countries to sustain.

#### No benefit for relations

Ginsberg 9 – Senior Editor @ Roubini Global Economics

Julie, “Reassessing the Jackson-Vanik Amendment,” http://www.cfr.org/trade/reassessing-jackson-vanik-amendment/p19734

While experts agree that a U.S. decision not to graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik would be a setback for the countries' economic and political ties, the potential U.S. gains from graduation are subject to debate. Anders Aslund, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics and an adjunct professor at Georgetown University, asserts that Jackson-Vanik has contributed to making the United States a "least favored trading partner" of Russia, pointing out that only 4 percent of Russia's trade is with the United States. Other experts, like Sestanovich, say that ill will inspired by Jackson-Vanik has had minimal impact on trade and therefore the potential U.S. gains from graduating Russia from the amendment are small. Terminating Russia from Jackson-Vanik would be "symbolic of the ability of leaders on both sides to get rid of accumulated, irrelevant issues of friction in the relationship," Sestanovich says, "but it's symbolic friction. It doesn't actually have any real consequences, and the result is you can't actually expect any real payoff."

#### Not key to relations

Weitz 10 – Senior Fellow @ Hudson Institute

Richard, “The Bell Tolls for Jackson-Vanik Amendment?,” http://www.eurasianet.org/node/61052

The amendment, which became law in 1975, was designed to use punitive trade measures to force the then-Soviet Union to expand its human rights framework, especially in easing emigration restrictions. The Cold War may have ended almost two decades ago, but this particular legacy of superpower confrontation remains on the books. During Russian President Dmitry Medvedev’s visit to Washington in early April, he expressed a desire to see Jackson-Vanik repealed. On April 27, members of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe boosted Medvedev’s hopes that his wish might be granted, holding a hearing to examine the merits of repeal. These days, the amendment -- named after its sponsors, Sen. Henry Jackson and Rep. Charles Vanik -- has little practical effect on US-Russian relations. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, US presidents have annually found the Russian Federation to be in compliance with Jackson-Vanik’s provisions, thus enabling the maintenance of normal, bilateral trade relations. Russian leaders nevertheless are eager to officially remove the amendment’s stigma. These days, the amendment -- named after its sponsors, Sen. Henry Jackson and Rep. Charles Vanik -- has little practical effect on US-Russian relations. Since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, US presidents have annually found the Russian Federation to be in compliance with Jackson-Vanik’s provisions, thus enabling the maintenance of normal, bilateral trade relations. Russian leaders nevertheless are eager to officially remove the amendment’s stigma.

#### And, its been on the books for decades – empirically disproves their internal link.

Ivanov 8/13

Eugene Ivanov. April 13, 2011. “Looking beyond the reset”. Russia Beyond the Headlines. http://rbth.ru/articles/2011/04/13/looking\_beyond\_the\_reset\_12690.html

Equally important, the “reset” has changed the very tone of U.S.-Russia dialogue and created conditions for its further advancement. As pointed out by Robert Legvold, a prominent Russia expert from Columbia University, the reset can be considered a success if only because there are now expectations of further progress in U.S.-Russia relations. It is time now to view the reset not as an end in itself, but, rather, as a mean to advance an agenda in U.S.-Russia relations for the next 10-15 years. To create such an agenda won’t be easy. The Cold War might be officially over, but fighting its ghosts is still a popular business on both sides. Although the emotional disdain many folks in Moscow harbor towards the notorious Jackson-Vanik amendment is understandable, focusing too much attention on its repeal is a distraction: A relic of the past that long outlived its usefulness, the amendment, as it legally stands, is completely irrelevant. Moreover, some analysts even argue that the emphasis on arms control—the principal topic of the Moscow-Washington dialogue in the Cold War era and since—distorts and, ultimately, slows down U.S.-Russia relations by shifting attention and energy from other critical issues. In this regard, it’s worth noting that the only think tank in Russia that is fully devoted to the topic of U.S.-Russia relations, the Institute for the U.S. and Canadian Studies, specializes precisely in the area of arms control. Russia would definitely benefit from developing additional, more diverse, intellectual resources to deal with the whole spectrum of relations.

### **US-Russia Relations Resilient**

#### Even if relations are low now, they’re resilient

Sigov 6/24

(Mike Sigov, columnist for Blade, a Toledo newspaper, 6/24/12, “Politics drives Obama, Putin's friendly façade”, http://www.toledoblade.com/MikeSigov/2012/06/24/Politics-drives-Obama-Putin-s-friendly-facade.html)

Despite bad blood between President Obama and Russian President Vladimir Putin, their meeting on the sidelines of a Group of 20 economic summit in Mexico has not further damaged already sour U.S.-Russian relations. They can't afford that right now -- not while Mr. Obama is seeking re-election and Mr. Putin is facing growing political dissent at home. Following the ex-KGB officer's return to the Russian presidency via a blatantly rigged election, those relations spun at every key sticking issue -- from Russia's support of Syrian President Bashar Assad's atrocious regime to Moscow's refusal to play along in heading off Iran's nuclear weapons program to the U.S.-led missile defense program in Europe that the Kremlin insists on seeing as destabilizing the nuclear weapons parity between the United States and Russia. It is hard to expect relations between the United States and Russia to improve anytime soon -- not after Mr. Obama predictably snubbed Mr. Putin by waiting for a week before making a congratulatory phone call to his Russian counterpart. Apparently it was done to allow a scandal over the Russian presidential election to blow over. Mr. Putin reacted by standing up the U.S, president, who had moved a recent Group of Eight economic summit from Chicago to Camp David to better accommodate a meeting. But right now the two leaders need each other for political survival. Hence their declaration of an agreement on the need for a political process to end the bloodshed in Syria -- where Russia has a naval base -- and Mr. Obama's even more general statement that the present tensions in U.S.-Russian relations may be eased. This, however, may take a long time. The sticking issues are deadlocked primarily because Mr. Putin is emulating a Cold-War era, zero-sum approach to the United States, "what's good for them is bad for us and vice versa." Some analysts say that's because of his Soviet upbringing and his KGB past. They are being naive. The reason is because Mr. Putin, who by some accounts has amassed an enormous fortune, is leading Russia down to a total autocracy. Appearing soft on the United States simply doesn't fit that course of action. This is exactly why he has been paying lip service to the need of a political resolution of the Syrian crisis while refusing to help achieve a regime change in Syria. Notably, the Kremlin has resisted the U.S. pressure on the Kremlin to prod Mr. Assad into seeking political asylum in Russia. Instead, Russia continues to arm the Assad regime and help escalate the conflict into a civil war. That said, Mr. Putin did not want to undermine the Obama policy of a U.S.-Russian relations reset because he understands that it is in his interest that Mr. Obama gets re-elected. Despite the U.S. criticism of human rights abuses in Russia -- to which Mr. Putin is sensitive -- the alternative would be worse for him.

**Relations resilient – empirics prove we’ve overcome bigger issues.**

**Pifer 12**. [Steven, Senior Fellow @ Brookings, “The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship” Brookings Institute -- March 21 -- http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2012/0321\_arms\_control\_pifer.aspx]

**By any objective measure, the U.S.-Russian relationship is stronger today than it was in 2008. Then, sharp differences over the future of strategic arms limitations, missile defense in Europe, NATO enlargement and Georgia dominated the agenda. Relations** between Washington and Moscow **plunged to their lowest point** since the end of the Soviet Union. The bilateral relationship had become so thin that there are no indications that concern about damaging it affected in any way the Kremlin’s decisions regarding military operations against Georgia. The Russian government saw little of value to lose in its relationship with Washington. That was not a good situation from the point of view of U.S. interests. **It is different today. There are things in the U.S.-Russian relationship that Moscow cares about, and that translates to leverage and even a restraining influence on Russian actions. This does not mean that all is going well** on the U.S.-Russia agenda. Although the rhetoric is less inflammatory than it was four years ago, **missile defense poses a difficult problem on both the bilateral and NATO-Russia agendas. The countries clearly differ over Syria**. Moscow’s misguided support for Mr. Assad—which stems from the fact that he is one of Russia’s few allies and from the Russian desire to pay NATO back for what they consider the misuse of March 2011 UN Security Council Resolution 1973 on Libya—have led the Kremlin to an unwise policy. It is alienating the Arab world and will position Moscow poorly with the Syrian people once Mr. Assad leaves the scene.

#### **Relations resilient- even thought Putin and Obama might not agree on all issues, they put it aside to create mutual solutions and policies**

Associated Press 6/18

(Anne Gearen, staffwriter for AP, 6/18/12, “Obama: Putin talks candid, tensions can be eased”, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5g-cnofcQ3tMvWBvA58kUyhCf7Ztw?docId=6d2c8e74a8f442e8a155cd47703d8e9f)

Obama and Putin had a brisk handshake at the end, and their tones were cool. Putin campaigned last year with some of the harshest anti-American rhetoric from Russia in a decade, and his return to the top job in Russia ensures that cooperation with the United States will come at a cost. White House officials played down the notion of tense relationship between the two leaders, saying the businesslike approach was simply Putin's style. "That's the way he looks. That's the way he acts," said Michael McFaul, the U.S. ambassador to Russia. Putin spokesman Dmitry Peskov said the meeting was "very open" and not confrontational. While there are areas of disagreement, Peskov said both leaders affirmed their willingness to find "mutual solutions to existing problems." Obama voiced similar hope he and Putin could "find constructive ways to manage through any bilateral tensions."

#### Relations are resilient.

Kuchins ‘11

Andrew C Kuchins, director of the Russia and Eurasia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, co-editor of “Russia after the Global Economic Crisis”. “A Durable Reset”. The New York Times. 9/13/2011. http://www.nytimes.com/2011/09/14/opinion/14iht-edkuchins14.html

In recent months, however, critical voices in both countries have grown louder about prospects for further rapprochement. Skeptics point to disagreements over missile defense, the revolutionary events in the Middle East, the seemingly never-ending negotiations over Russia’s W.T.O. accession and other issues. Some analysts and political figures in both countries also cite the possibility that Vladimir Putin will return as Russia’s president in 2012 as a threat to future cooperation. But unlike the two previous U.S.-Russian honeymoons, both of which ended in disappointment — in 1991-1992 after the emergence of the new Russia, and in 2001-2002 after 9/11 — the current warming trend should be more sustainable. To understand why, it is instructive to understand the Russian motivations for improved ties with Washington, and also the likely impact of Russian presidential elections on ties with Washington. Until the autumn of 2008, the mainstream Russian view — expounded by Putin — was of the United States in decline as economic troubles mounted and setbacks in Afghanistan and Iraq sapped U.S. power. By contrast, Russia was on the rise, and a truly multipolar world was emerging. The unexpected impact of the global economic crisis on Russia in the fall of 2008 struck a blow to this narrative, revealing as it did the vulnerability of Russia’s economic growth. The Russian economy was the hardest hit of all members of the Group of 20, and this sobering event led to renewed efforts to integrate with the West in order to advance the modernization of Russia. Russian elites also began to acknowledge that the balance of global economic and political power may not be shifting in their favor. After the dust settled from the fall of 2008, Moscow viewed China as having come out on top. After years of focusing on the United States as the source of dangers to Russia, Moscow has become increasingly concerned about the rapid development of China and its growing influence in Russia, especially in Siberia and the Far East, and in Central Asia, the Caspian and other areas that Medvedev has dubbed Russia’s “zone of privileged interests.” The Russian elections will not fundamentally alter these challenges for Russia. History suggests that American policies will be a far greater factor than Russian politics in shaping Russian policies toward the United States. The Russian assessment of America’s power and role in the world did not change because Medvedev replaced Putin as president; it changed because of the global economic crisis and Washington’s policies.

## \*\*\*Aff AT MPX\*\*\*

### AT Russia War Impact

#### No war – weak arsenal

Perkovich ‘3 – Director of the Nonproliferation Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

George. vice president for studies and director of the Nonproliferation Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. March/April 2003. Foreign Affairs. <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=16207>.

As for Russia, a full-scale war between it and the United States now seems inconceivable. Given the desires for larger cuts in nuclear forces that Russia displayed in negotiating the 2002 Moscow Treaty, Russia hardly seems enough of a threat to justify the size and forward-leaning posture of America's present arsenal.

#### No war – economics

Maisaia ‘8 – USAFA Defense Fellow

Vakhtang, PhD USAFA Defense Fellow, Military Expert, A War With Russia: Real Concern or Fabricated?, 3/3/8. Online

The Russian economy is in deep recession due to the global financial crisis and poor management and could not bear the burden of an additional $5 million a day in war costs. The economic crisis is additional reason why waging war is less probable as war against another sovereign state could lead to social disorder, including in the Armed Forces.

#### No war – politics

Maisaia ‘8 – USAFA Defense Fellow

Vakhtang, PhD USAFA Defense Fellow, Military Expert, A War With Russia: Real Concern or Fabricated?, 3/3/8. Online

Moscow is seeking to communicate with the new US Administration and with the EU and damaging the already weak international position of Russia does not serve the interests of the incumbent authorities of the Russian Federation. The first Medvedev-Obama meeting, which will probably take place on April 2, will be a most interesting and fascinating event which will engender some corrections in the foreign policy formulation and strategic calculations of the Russian Federation. Hence, Moscow will manipulate the Medvedev-Sarkozy peace plan to present itself as a credible partner in international relations, mostly in terms of combating international terrorism and the Afghanistan mission, which is the number 1 priority for Obama Administration policy making.

### AT: Russia Relations MPX

#### US and Russia will not work cooperatively to solve problems – differing interests and priorities, Russia does not need the U.S. and have negative demands, dislike American solutions, and are concerned with domestic issues.

Shleifer and Treisman ’11 – Professor of Economic at Harvard and Professor of PoliSci at UCLA

Andrei Shleifer, Professor of Economics at Harvard University, and Daniel Treisman, Professor of Political Science at the University of California,Los Angeles, and a Visiting Fellow at the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna. “Why Moscow Says No: A Question of Russian Interests, Not Psychology”. Foreign Affairs. Jan/Feb 2011. Vol. 90, Iss. 1; pg. 122. ProQuest.

Today, Russia and the United States share few interests and even fewer priorities. Where their interests do overlap, Russian leaders often doubt the efficacy of U.S. strategy. Moreover, there is an imbalance: whereas the United States, as a global superpower, needs Russia's help in addressing many issues, Russia needs the United States for relatively little. Russia's main demand is entirely negative: that Washington stop expanding nato and emboldening anti-Russian governments and nongovernmental organizations on its periphery. Russian foreign policy under Putin and Medvedev has been shaped by three objectives: boosting economic growth, fostering friendly regimes in other former Soviet states, and preventing terrorism at home. As the Russian leadership sees it, success in each area is critical to retaining power and domestic support.

#### Despite the reset in US-Russia relations Russia will continually block true multilateral progress.

Shleifer and Treisman ’11 – Professor of Economic at Harvard and Professor of PoliSci at UCLA

Andrei Shleifer, Professor of Economics at Harvard University, and Daniel Treisman, Professor of Political Science at the University of California,Los Angeles, and a Visiting Fellow at the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna. “Why Moscow Says No: A Question of Russian Interests, Not Psychology”. Foreign Affairs. Jan/Feb 2011. Vol. 90, Iss. 1; pg. 122. ProQuest.

Russia's international behavior during the last decade has puzzled many U.S. observers. As seen from Washington, the greatest challenges of the moment-terrorism, nuclear proliferation, climate change-are global ones that threaten all states. The United States has been trying to organize multilateral responses. Yet the Kremlin has proved singularly unhelpful. For years, Russian negotiators have stalled efforts to compel Iran and North Korea to give up their nuclear weapons programs. Meanwhile, Moscow has applied economic and diplomatic pressure to keep nearby states from joining nato or letting U.S. troops use their bases to fight the Taliban in Afghanistan. And in August 2008, Russia invaded Georgia and effectively detached two mountain enclaves from its territory. More recently, some have seen hints of a thaw in U.S.-Russian relations. Last June, U.S. President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev chatted over hamburgers in Washington and announced that their countries' relationship had been "reset." Moscow signed a new treaty to replace the expiring Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) and backed a UN resolution tightening sanctions on Iran. But in other ways, the Kremlin continues to disappoint. Russia only agreed to sanctions against Iran that allowed Russia to continue selling the country nuclear power stations and, apparently, developing its oil and gas sectors. Closer to home, Russia has conducted military exercises simulating an invasion of Poland and has deployed advanced antiaircraft missiles in Abkhazia.

### AT: Russia Relations MPX – Laundry List

#### Russia is unlikely to cooperate with the U.S. on any major initiatives.

Shleifer and Treisman ’11 – Professor of Economic at Harvard and Professor of PoliSci at UCLA

Andrei Shleifer, Professor of Economics at Harvard University, and Daniel Treisman, Professor of Political Science at the University of California,Los Angeles, and a Visiting Fellow at the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna. “Why Moscow Says No: A Question of Russian Interests, Not Psychology”. Foreign Affairs. Jan/Feb 2011. Vol. 90, Iss. 1; pg. 122. ProQuest.

With very few exceptions, Russia does not need or want help from Washington in achieving its main objectives. What it would value is for the United States to stop interfering in its neighborhood, militarizing the border states, and attempting to undermine Russia's position in energy markets. rational ambivalence Nonetheless, Russia might still hope that the United States succeeds in its global endeavors. For example, the Kremlin has no desire to see Afghanistan controlled by the Taliban. A victory for radical Islamists there could embolden insurgencies throughout Central Asia and invigorate the North Caucasus' terrorist networks. Yet Russian officials are unsure that nato can defeat the Taliban or at least impose a stable settlement. Looking ahead to the situation after U.S. troops leave, the Kremlin does not want to take positions now that will make it impossible to deal with Kabul's future rulers. Moscow also knows that some level of tension keeps its southern neighbors in line. When they feel threatened by the Taliban, Central Asia's leaders are more ready to cooperate in the Moscow-led Collective Security Treaty Organization and to welcome Russia's military presence in the region. At the same time, Moscow is concerned about the recent flood of Afghan heroin across its borders; opium production has doubled since the nato invasion. And polls show that Russia's public is far less happy than Putin and Medvedev about assisting nato in Afghanistan. Iran evokes another set of complicated calculations. Moscow would prefer that Tehran not develop nuclear weapons. Yet many Russian officials doubt that even the toughest economic sanctions- fully backed by Russia-would prevent this outcome. Meanwhile, Russia has economic interests in Iran that it would be costly to jeopardize. Its exports to the country have grown from $250 million in 1995 to $3.3 billion in 2008. Moscow hopes for contracts to build additional nuclear power stations, develop oil and gas fields, and supply Iran with modern weapons. It also is loath to give Tehran's radicals any excuses for stirring up trouble in the North Caucasus. A resolution of the conflict between Tehran and Washington would threaten Russia's commercial and strategic interests. Western investment would likely pour into the Iranian oil and gas sectors, competing with Russian multinationals. The lifting of sanctions and the lowering of tensions would depress petroleum prices; new pipelines might be built to carry Iranian gas to Europe. In many ways, the current stalemate serves the Kremlin's purposes. And on the question of North Korea's nuclear program, Russia would like to see Pyongyang disarm but doubts that even its strong support for sanctions would have much of an effect. At the same time, it worries that any military escalation or a collapse of the regime in Pyongyang could send refugees flooding into Russia's Far East. The New start treaty mostly ratified cuts in the Russian nuclear arsenal that were occurring anyway as the weapons aged. Further reductions are not so clearly in Russia's interest; as antimissile systems become more accurate and powerful, Moscow will need to maintain enough missiles and warheads to remain sure of a second-strike capability. On climate change, the Kremlin recognizes that global warming would impose huge costs, causing floods and destroying infrastructure. Still, how the expense of cutting pollution should be shared among the major industrial and industrializing countries remains contentious. Like other countries, Russia has a powerful pro-carbon lobby. limited but constructive Washington should not expect much help from Moscow, not because Kremlin officials are overwhelmed by wounded pride and paranoia but because Washington's priorities are not their priorities- and may not be in their interest at all. The parallel with U.S.-Chinese relations is instructive. In dealing with Beijing, U.S. policymakers perceive conflicts of interest for what they are. They do not feel compelled to patronize and psychoanalyze their Chinese counterparts. It is hard to imagine a U.S. president on the eve of a Beijing summit berating President Hu for his obsolete Marxist mentality and promising to build up Premier Wen Jiabao as a counterweight. If divergent interests make a close relationship between Moscow and Washington unlikely in the next few years, there are grounds for greater optimism in the long run. As its interactions with the United States have shrunk, Russia has been gradually integrating into Europe, both economically and culturally. Because these changes are slow and not particularly dramatic, they have gone largely unnoticed. As it develops further, Russia will become even more European-without losing its distinct identity. In 2008, Russians made 39 times as many trips to western Europe and 19 times as many trips to China as they did to the United States. Of the 41,000 Russian students who studied abroad in 2008, 20,000 were at institutions in Europe; only 5,000 were in the United States. Meanwhile, in 2009,Russians were more likely to buy property in Bulgaria, Montenegro, Germany, Spain, and the Czech Republic than in the United States.

### AT: Russia Relations MPX –Accidents

#### Communication checks prevent accidents.

**Ford 8.** [Chris, Senior Fellow & Director @ Center for Technology and Global Security @ Hudson Institute, “Dilemmas of Nuclear Force ‘De-Alerting’” Int’l Peace Institute Policy Forum -- October 7 -- www.hudson.org/files/documents/De-Alerting%20FINAL2%20(2).pdf]

The United States and Russia have also worked for years to improve communications, reduce misunderstandings, and develop ways to lessen the risk of inadvertent launch or other errors in their strategic relationship. Most readers will be familiar with the Direct Communications Link (the famous “hotline”) established in 1963.27 In 1971, however, Washington and Moscow also signed an agreement establishing basic procedures to increase mutual consultation and notification regarding relatively innocent but potentially alarming activities – thereby reducing the risk of accidental nuclear war.28 Since 1987, the two parties have also operated securely-linked 24-hour communications centers – the U.S. node of which is the Nuclear Risk Reduction Center (NRRC) operated by the State Department29 – which specialize in transmitting such things as the notifications required under arms control treaties. Pursuant to a 1988 memorandum, NRRC transmittals, which go directly to the Russian Ministry of Defense, include ballistic missile launch notifications. This link also proved useful to help prevent strategic tensions after the terrorist assault of September 11, 2001 – at which point U.S. officials used the NRRC to reassure their Russian counterparts that the sudden American security alert in the wake of the Manhattan and Pentagon attacks was not in any way an indication of impending U.S. belligerence vis-à-vis Russia.

### AT: Russia Relations MPX – Relations Miscalc

#### Low probability of miscalculation or war

Lowther ‘9

Adam. Defense Analyst, Air Force Research Institute. Challenging Nuclear Abolition. August 2009. Online.

With more than 60 years of nuclear weapons experience, there is also a low probability of political miscalculation. Neither the president of the United States nor his counterpart in Moscow has ever “miscalculated” and launched a nuclear weapon. Rather than expecting miscalculation, a better approach may be to assist other nuclear powers in developing the sound practices that have led to six decades of American and Russian restraint.

### AT: Russia Relations MPX – Warming

Russia won’t cooperate on solving warming – pollution cuts are contentious and powerful oil lobby.

Shleifer and Treisman ’11 – Professor of Economic at Harvard and Professor of PoliSci at UCLA

Andrei Shleifer, Professor of Economics at Harvard University, and Daniel Treisman, Professor of Political Science at the University of California,Los Angeles, and a Visiting Fellow at the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna. “Why Moscow Says No: A Question of Russian Interests, Not Psychology”. Foreign Affairs. Jan/Feb 2011. Vol. 90, Iss. 1; pg. 122. ProQuest.

The New start treaty mostly ratified cuts in the Russian nuclear arsenal that were occurring anyway as the weapons aged. Further reductions are not so clearly in Russia's interest; as antimissile systems become more accurate and powerful, Moscow will need to maintain enough missiles and warheads to remain sure of a second-strike capability. On climate change, the Kremlin recognizes that global warming would impose huge costs, causing floods and destroying infrastructure. Still, how the expense of cutting pollution should be shared among the major industrial and industrializing countries remains contentious. Like other countries, Russia has a powerful pro-carbon lobby.

#### Russia will not cooperate to solve warming – hydrocarbons are critical to their economy, which is their top priority.

Shleifer and Treisman ’11 – Professor of Economic at Harvard and Professor of PoliSci at UCLA

Andrei Shleifer, Professor of Economics at Harvard University, and Daniel Treisman, Professor of Political Science at the University of California,Los Angeles, and a Visiting Fellow at the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna. “Why Moscow Says No: A Question of Russian Interests, Not Psychology”. Foreign Affairs. Jan/Feb 2011. Vol. 90, Iss. 1; pg. 122. ProQuest.

Russian foreign policy under Putin and Medvedev has been shaped by three objectives: boosting economic growth, fostering friendly regimes in other former Soviet states, and preventing terrorism at home. As the Russian leadership sees it, success in each area is critical to retaining power and domestic support. Economic growth comes first. The Kremlin understands that power in today's world rests on economic might. As Putin noted back in February 2000, "There can be no superpower where weakness and poverty reign." At home, Russia's rulers know that they owe their popularity to the economy's remarkable revival. Gdp per capita, adjusted for purchasing power parity, increased from under $7,000 in 1999 to almost $16,000 in 2008 (around that of Ireland in 1987 or Portugal in 1989). Oil and gas played a major role in this boom. Today, hydrocarbons fund about one-third of the Russian government's budget. Although both Putin and Medvedev have spoken of economic modernization and diversification, they realize that at least for the next decade, the country's prosperity will depend on securing stable markets and relatively high prices for its oil and gas. Given recent history, they must be terrified that should these conditions change, not just the country's prosperity but also their own political survival would be at stake. Although the plunge in oil prices in the early 1980s was not the only reason the Soviet Union collapsed a few years later, it was important. Later, after oil prices sank to $9 a barrel in June 1998, Russia defaulted on its debt, finishing off the reputation of Yeltsin's reformers. It is no surprise, then, that Russia's reliance on fuel exports shapes how its leaders view the world. Most of the country's oil and gas exports go to Europe. Overall, imports from Russia accounted for only about 18 percent of energy consumption in the eu in 2007 (when comprehensive data were last available). But some individual countries are much more dependent. Whereas in 2007 France and Germany received 14 percent and 36 percent of their gas from Russia, respectively, the corresponding figures were higher for countries further to the east: 48 percent for Poland, 92 percent for Bulgaria, and 100 percent for the three Baltic states. Some believe that this trade exposes these nations to political pressure from the Kremlin. In 2008, then British Prime Minister Gordon Brown warned that Europe risked being caught in "an energy stranglehold" by states such as Russia.

### 2AC Econ Low

#### Russian economy weak- World Bank reports multiple factors offset high oil prices

-aging population, unproductive workers, no business investment, high industry spending

-growth will slow .8% this year

Kramer ‘12

Andrew, Russian Economy Slow to Recover, World Bank Says, NYTIMES, 3/27/12 http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/28/business/global/russian-economy-slow-to-recover-world-bank-says.html?\_r=1&pagewanted=print

Russia is rebounding from the global recession more slowly than other developing countries despite high oil prices, according to a report Tuesday by the World Bank that hints at problems awaiting Vladimir V. Putin as he assumes his third term as president. A number of factors are weakening the Russian economy, the World Bank said: The aging population, unproductive workers, and business executives who are reluctant to invest over the long term, fearful of risk in general but with specific concerns about Russia. The report called low capital investment a particular concern. Russia is spending on factory equipment, trucks and airplanes at a level typical of more developed economies like Germany. High oil prices have obscured these economic vulnerabilities. Russia had a budget surplus equivalent to 0.8 percent of gross domestic product last year. But the structural problems pose a challenge for Mr. Putin, who will be inaugurated to a new six-year term as president in May. “On a closer examination, the country’s economic situation reveals a number of weaknesses,” Kaspar Richter, the bank’s chief economist for Russia, said about the report, a quarterly analysis of the Russian economy. The bank estimated that Russian economic growth would slow from 4.3 percent last year to 3.5 percent this year, before picking up slightly in 2013. For comparison, other developing economies grew at a pace of 5.5 percent on average last year, according to the report. The slower growth in Russia is even more remarkable in light of expectations economists had for the country just a few years ago. Since the economic crisis, Russia’s long-term trajectory has departed from expectations far more starkly than countries it is often compared with, like China, India and Brazil. By 2011, Russia’s gross domestic product was 20 percent lower than what was estimated in forecasts by World Bank economists in 2007. Other developing economies contracted less sharply, and have grown faster since. As a group, these countries’ economies are now only 5 percent smaller than estimates made before the global slowdown. Russia’s rebound also looks lackluster compared with its own performance after an earlier crisis, in 1998. Then, the economy recovered in seven quarters. This time, it took 14 quarters, or more than three years, the World Bank said. Russia’s public finances still appear robust compared with ailing European neighbors. Its public-sector debt is only 10 percent of the gross domestic product, compared with more than 100 percent for many European states. One problem is Russia’s workers. They are far less productive than their counterparts in the wealthy countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Hour for hour, Russian workers produce only 43 percent of what their counterparts in developed countries do, the report said. The slower growth has brought added risks for Russia. Increases in public-sector spending since 2008 helped buoy the economy but also increased the risks of budget deficits if oil prices decline. That is now looking more likely as worries of war in Iran fade. Government welfare spending accounted for 11 percent of Russian household incomes in 2007; by 2011, government spending made up 18 percent. Such benefits for the population are extraordinarily difficult to reverse without dire political consequences. The added spending kept the poverty rate, at about 13 percent of the population, level over the past four years despite high food inflation, the bank noted.

### AT: Repeal k/t Econ

#### Improving investment ties relies on reforms in Moscow.

Pifer 3/21

Steven Pifer, Senior Fellow, Foreign Policy, Center on the United States and Europe. “The Future Course of the U.S.-Russia Relationship”. March 21, 2012. House Committee on Foreign Affairs. http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2012/0321\_arms\_control\_pifer.aspx

Achieving a boost in bilateral trade and investment links, however, will depend more than anything on steps that Moscow takes to improve the business and investment climate within Russia. While the growing Russian market attracts American companies, many are put off by the absence of rule of law, rampant corruption, corporate-raiding and complex tax, customs and regulatory systems. The cases of Hermitage Capital and Sergey Magnitsky sadly testify to the daunting challenges of doing business in Russia, and lead investors and trading companies to turn to other markets. If the Russian government wants to modernize its economy and enjoy the benefits of full integration into the global economic system, it will have to come to grips with these problems.

#### Removing Jackson Vanik won’t have any effect on the economy

CFR 9

7/2/09, Reassessing the Jackson-Vanik Amendment http://www.cfr.org/trade/reassessing-jackson-vanik-amendment/p19734#p5

While experts agree that a U.S. decision not to graduate Russia from Jackson-Vanik would be a setback for the countries' economic and political ties, the potential U.S. gains from graduation are subject to debate. Anders Aslund, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics and an adjunct professor at Georgetown University, asserts that Jackson-Vanik has contributed to making the United States a "least favored trading partner" of Russia, pointing out that only 4 percent of Russia's trade is with the United States. Other experts, like Sestanovich, say that ill will inspired by Jackson-Vanik has had minimal impact on trade and therefore the potential U.S. gains from graduating Russia from the amendment are small. Terminating Russia from Jackson-Vanik would be "symbolic of the ability of leaders on both sides to get rid of accumulated, irrelevant issues of friction in the relationship," Sestanovich says, "but it's symbolic friction. It doesn't actually have any real consequences, and the result is you can't actually expect any real payoff."

\*Sestanovich is a senior fellow @ CFR

### AT: Repeal k/t U.S.-Russia Trade

#### Economic costs of Jackson-Vanik on trade are zero.

Sestanovich ‘9

Stephen Sestanovich, a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and a professor of international diplomacy at Columbia University, was the American ambassador at large for the former Soviet Union from 1997 to 2001. “Cold War Leftovers”. May 19, 2009. The New York Times. http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/20/opinion/20sestanovich.html

Economic reasons are the least likely to carry the day. Although American companies may complain about the obstacles they face doing business in Russia, trade is booming. American exports to Russia have tripled since 2004, and our own imports from Russia have more than doubled. Russia remains the world’s single largest importer of American poultry, and in 2008 its pork imports from the United States were up 94 percent from the year before. Russian-American trade relations are not exactly “normal” with Jackson-Vanik on the books, but the economic cost is actually zero.

#### Lack of IPR, and Russian economic and regulatory policies prevent trade and investment.

Cooper ‘11

William H. Cooper, Specialist in International Trade and Finance. “Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) Status for Russia and U.S.-Russian Economic Ties”. November 4, 2011. www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS21123.pdf

Russia’s treatment of imports of U.S. meats—poultry, pork, and beef—is one of the most sensitive issues in U.S.-Russian trade relations. Russia’s agricultural sector, particularly meat production, has not been very competitive, and domestic producers have not been able to fulfill Russia’s expanding demand for meat, especially as the rise of Russian incomes has led to a rise in demand for meat in the Russian diet. U.S. producers, especially of poultry, have been able to take advantage and have become major sources of meat to the Russian market. At the same time, Russia has become an important market for U.S. exports of meat. For example, in 2009, Russia was the largest market for U.S. poultry meat exports.4 On January 1, 2010, the Russian government implemented new regulations on imports of poultry, claiming that the chlorine wash that U.S. poultry producers use in the preparation of chickens violates Russian standards and is unsafe. These regulations effectively halted U.S. exports of poultry to Russia. The United States claimed that the wash is effective and safe and that Russian restrictions are not scientifically based. U.S. and Russian officials conducted discussions to resolve the issue. At their June 24, 2010, press conference that closed a bilateral summit meeting, President Obama and President Medvedev announced that the dispute over poultry trade had been resolved and that U.S. shipments of poultry to Russia would resume. However, the full resumption of shipments was delayed over Russian demands to inspect U.S. poultry processing plants before they can certified for shipping to Russia. On September 30, 2010, the two countries reportedly reached a compromise on this issue whereby Russian inspectors would examine and certify U.S. plants on an expedited basis.5 However, as a result of the Russian restrictions, U.S. exports of poultry to Russia plummeted 59% as of the of 2010 compared to 2009.6 The lack of adequate intellectual property rights (IPR) protection in Russia has tainted the business climate in Russia for U.S. investors for some time. The Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) consistently identifies Russia in its Special 301 Report as a “priority watch list” country, as it did in its latest (April 30, 2011) report. The USTR report acknowledges improvements in IPR protection and cites steps taken to fulfill its commitments to improve IPR protection made as part of the 2006 bilateral agreement that was reached as part of Russia’s WTO accession process. It also finds that Russia has problems with weak enforcement of IPR in some areas, including internet piracy.7 Russian economic policies and regulations have been a source of concerns. The United States and the U.S. business community have asserted that structural problems and inefficient government regulations and policies have been a major cause of the low levels of trade and investment with the United States. Russia maintains high tariffs on some goods that U.S. manufacturers try to export. For example, tariffs on cars plus the excise tax that is prorated for engine displacement adds close to 70% on the price of imported U.S. passenger cars and sports utility vehicles. U.S. exporters have also cited problems with Russian customs regulations that are complicated and time-consuming.

## \*\*\*Aff Impact Turns\*\*\*

### Human Rights DA

#### Unconditional repeal leads to Russian aggression and human rights violations

Alexeeva 10 – former Chair of the Moscow Helsinki Group

Ludmilla, Woodrow Wilson Center, “The Legacy and Consequences of Jackson-Vanik: Reassessing Human Rights in 21st Century Russia,” Scholar

Indeed, we were discussing it yesterday. It was a serious discussion, where we tried to figure out the best way to repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment. Those who know the situation in the United States well insisted that the amend- ment should be repealed unconditionally, sim- ply because the relevant conditions have been met. However, I know our politicians and I know that if this amendment is repealed uncon- ditionally or without asking for anything in re- turn, they will interpret it as if the West agrees that everything is all right with human rights in Russia and they should not be concerned about it or talk about it.

#### Leads to extinction

Human Rights Web 97

<http://www.hrweb.org/intro.html>

Many also realized that advances in technology and changes in social structures had rendered war a threat to the continued existence of the human race. Large numbers of people in many countries lived under the control of tyrants, having no recourse but war to relieve often intolerable living conditions. Unless some way was found to relieve the lot of these people, they could revolt and become the catalyst for another wide-scale and possibly nuclear war. For perhaps the first time, representatives from the majority of governments in the world came to the conclusion that basic human rights must be protected, not only for the sake of the individuals and countries involved, but to preserve the human race.

#### HR violations leads to Chechen terrorism

McFaul 4 – Professor of Political Science @ Stanford

Michael, Russia’s Transition to Democracy and U.S.-Russia Relations: Unfinished Business, Center for American Progress, http://www.americanprogress.org/kf/russia\_mcfaul.pdf

Putin’s armed forces continue to abuse the human rights innocent citizens on a massive scale in Chechnya. Russia may have had the right to use force to defend its borders, but the means deployed to fight this war – summary executions, torture, bombings of villages, the rape of Chechen women, and the inhumane treatment of prisoners of war – cannot be defended. This kind of war has not made Russia more secure or helped the United States and our allies in the battle against terrorism. On the contrary, the war has inspired more fanaticism among enemies of both Russia and the United States.

#### Chechen terrorism leads to nuclear use on Moscow that escalates.

-and global nuclear terrorism

Allison 5 – Professor @ Harvard

Graham, The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe, Google Book

Chechen separatists have a long-standing interest in acquiring nuclear weapons and material to use in their campaign against Rus-sia. Aside from the submarine plot, Chechen militants made off with radioactive materials from a Grozny nuclear waste plant in January 2000; stole radioactive metals—possibly including some plutonium—from the Volgodonskaya nuclear power station in the southern region of Rostov between July 2001 and July 2002; and cased the railway system and special trains designed for shipping nuclear weapons across Russia.41 Al Qaeda and other Islamic extremist organizations are among their largest sources of financial support. While the Chechens target of choice for their first nuclear terrorist attack will surely be Moscow, that fact provides little com-fort for Americans. If the Chechens are successful in acquiring several nuclear weapons, their Al Qaeda brethren could well find themselves the means to match their motivation.

#### Nuclear terrorism on Russia means extinction—Russia has a “dead hand” device that will set off in response to a nuclear attack—this isn’t a myth and the most qualified expert in the field says it exists

Rosenbaum 7

Ron Rosenbaum, award winning journalist and author, 8/31/2007. “The Return of the Doomsday Machine?” Slate, http://www.slate.com/id/2173108/pagenum/all/

"The nuclear doomsday machine." It's a Cold War term that has long seemed obsolete. And even back then, the "doomsday machine" was regarded as a scary conjectural fiction. Not impossible to create—the physics and mechanics of it were first spelled out by U.S. nuclear scientist Leo Szilard—but never actually created, having a real existence only in such apocalyptic nightmares as Stanley Kubrick's Dr. Strangelove. In Strangelove, the doomsday machine was a Soviet system that automatically detonated some 50 cobalt-jacketed hydrogen bombs pre-positioned around the planet if the doomsday system's sensors detected a nuclear attack on Russian soil. Thus, even an accidental or (as in Strangelove) an unauthorized U.S. nuclear bomb could set off the doomsday machine bombs, releasing enough deadly cobalt fallout to make the Earth uninhabitable for the human species for 93 years. No human hand could stop the fully automated apocalypse. An extreme fantasy, yes. But according to a new book called Doomsday Men and several papers on the subject by U.S. analysts, it may not have been merely a fantasy. According to these accounts, the Soviets built and activated a variation of a doomsday machine in the mid-'80s. And there is no evidence Putin's Russia has deactivated the system. Instead, something was reactivated in Russia last week. I'm referring to the ominous announcement—given insufficient attention by most U.S. media (the Economist made it the opening of a lead editorial on Putin's Russia)—by Vladimir Putin that Russia has resumed regular "strategic flights" of nuclear bombers. (They may or may not be carrying nuclear bombs, but you can practically hear Putin's smirking tone as he says, "Our [nuclear bomber] pilots have been grounded for too long. They are happy to start a new life.") These twin developments raise a troubling question: What are the United States' and Russia's current nuclear policies with regard to how and when they will respond to a perceived nuclear attack? In most accounts, once the president or Russian premier receives radar warning of an attack, they have less than 15 minutes to decide whether the warning is valid. The pressure is on to "use it or lose it"—launch our missiles before they can be destroyed in their silos. Pressure that makes the wrong decision more likely. Pressure that makes accidental nuclear war a real possibility. Once you start to poke into this matter, you discover a disturbing level of uncertainty, which leads me to believe we should be demanding that the United States and Russia define and defend their nuclear postures. Bush and Putin should be compelled to tell us just what "failsafe" provisions are installed on their respective nuclear bombers, missiles, and submarines—what the current provisions against warning malfunctions are and what kinds of controls there are over the ability of lone madman nuclear bombers to bring on the unhappy end of history. As for the former Soviet Union, the possible existence of a version of a doomsday machine is both relevant and disturbing. In the Strangelove film, the Soviet ambassador tells the president and generals in the U.S. war room that the device was designed to deter a surprise attack, the kind of attack that might otherwise prevent retaliation by "decapitating" the Soviet command structure. The automated system would insure massive world-destroying retaliation even if the entire Soviet leadership were wiped out—or had second thoughts. As a result, some referred to it as the "dead hand" doomsday device. It is Dr. Strangelove himself, the madman U.S. nuclear strategist played by Peter Sellers, who detects the flaw in this plan. After being apprised of the system's existence by the Soviet ambassador, and the likelihood of its being triggered by a U.S. bomber on an unauthorized mission to nuke its Soviet target, Dr. Strangelove exclaims: Yes, but the ... whole point of the doomsday machine ... is lost ... if you keep it a secret! Why didn't you tell the world, eh? In other words, a doomsday machine kept secret is no good for deterrence, only for retaliation by extinction. Did the Soviets actually design a variation on a doomsday device and not tell us about it? And could an accidental or terrorist nuclear attack on Putin's Russia (by Chechens, for instance) trigger an antiquated automated dead-hand system and launch missiles capable of killing tens, maybe hundreds, of millions at unknown targets that might include the United States? Up until Aug. 10 of this year, I would have thought these questions were best consigned to the realm of apocalyptic film fantasy. But on that day I came upon a startling essay in the London Times Literary Supplement. It was a review (titled "Deadly Devices") of a book recently published in the United Kingdom: Doomsday Men: The Real Dr. Strangelove and the Dream of the Superweapon by nuclear-age historian P.D. Smith of University College London. (It will be out in the United States in December.) The TLS reviewer, Christopher Coker (who is on the faculty of the London School of Economics), asserted that the book demonstrates that "only after the Berlin Wall had been breached and ... the Cold War began to thaw did military analysts realize the Russians had actually built a version of the [doomsday] device. The details of this top-secret Soviet system were first revealed in 1993 by Bruce G. Blair, a former American ICBM launch control officer, now one of the country's foremost experts on Russian arms. Fearing that a sneak attack by American submarine-launched missiles might take Moscow out in 13 minutes, the Soviet leadership had authorized the construction of an automated communication network, reinforced to withstand a nuclear strike. At its heart was a computer system similar to the one in Dr. Strangelove. Its code name was Perimetr. It went fully operational in January 1985. It is still in place."

### 1AR HR Link

#### **Normalizing trade relations rewards Putin’s human rights abuses**

Hall 6/8

(Kevin G. Hall, 6/8/12, staffwriter for the Kansas City Star, “Trade puts US-Russian relations at turning point”, http://www.kansascity.com/2012/06/07/3648935/trade-puts-us-russian-relations.html#storylink=cpy#storylink=cpy)

Since the end of the Soviet Union in 1991, the U.S.-Russia relationship has seen ups and downs, lately more of the latter. Russia has stymied U.S. efforts to thwart Iran’s nuclear ambitions and has complicated efforts to isolate Syria. In the coming weeks, Congress will be presented with a tough choice: Should it stand up against human rights abuses in Russia or should it support greater access for U.S. companies to Russia’s more than 142 million consumers? It’s a choice lawmakers must make because Russia is readying to join the World Trade Organization, the Geneva-based body that sets rules for and polices international trade. Russia’s legislative body, the Duma, will take up the ratification of its WTO accession on July 4. The date appears to be Russia’s way of sending an Independence Day message to its former adversary. Since the 1970s and the Cold War, Russia has had limited access to the world’s largest economy. Russia is largely a commodity exporter, a global seller of crude oil, natural gas and minerals such as uranium. Those products are not sensitive to protectionism and other unfair trade practices. However, Russia offers exporters across the globe a big market for finished goods and services, and if it joins the WTO it will be subject to the same rules as the other 155 members. “We have a very complicated relationship with Russia, there’s no question about that,” said Christopher Wenk, senior director for international policy at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which is lobbying for what’s known as permanent normal trade relations with Russia, or PNTR. “It’s tough in terms of the foreign policy piece of our relationship … but the point we’re making is that PNTR is not about Russia, it is about the United States. This is really an issue about giving U.S. companies a level playing field in that market.” The problem for some U.S. lawmakers is that granting Russia normalized trade relations rewards its authoritarian leader, Vladimir Putin. The Obama administration has tried to reset relations with Russia, but Putin’s return to power, anti-American rhetoric and treatment of dissidents has upset human rights advocates. “Putin clearly has complicated things, and … human rights are not fully respected. That is quite evident, and of course Russia is not a democracy. It’s a relatively mild authoritarian state,” said Anders Aslund, a senior researcher and Russia expert at the Peterson Institute for International Economics in Washington.

#### Unconditional repeal is complicity with authoritarianism

Alexeeva 10 – former Chair of the Moscow Helsinki Group

Ludmilla, Woodrow Wilson Center, “The Legacy and Consequences of Jackson-Vanik: Reassessing Human Rights in 21st Century Russia,” Scholar

I am not the one to propose how to do it—I am far from familiar with your congressional process or with the intricacies of the U.S. po- litical life. But I am convinced that it should be done in such a way—you will have to think, specifically, which way—that makes this re- peal equivalent to a statement, saying that the right to leave the country and come back is the only civil right that remains in Russia today. No other civil rights are observed. All elections have been taken away—from governors to local and municipal governments. There is no free- dom in political life. There is no freedom for nonpolitical public organizations. Those whose actions or statements are not acceptable to the government are killed and the killers walk unpunished. If you repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment ignoring all this, you are de facto agreeing with the political and social environ- ment that exists in Russia today. I would very much hope that this conference, assembled by this esteemed institution, could find a way to do it.

### 2AC Russian Aggression DA

#### J-V key to leverage that prevents Russian aggression

Surkov 11

Nikolay, 10-31, “Entering the WTO together with Jackson-Vanik,” http://rt.com/politics/press/nezavisimaya/entering-wto-together-jackson-vanik/en/

Democrats are outraged by US Speaker of the House John Boehner’s arguments. US senators are refusing to lift the Jackson-Vanik amendment and normalize US trade relations with Russia until it agrees to make concessions which meet the interests of US producers and exporters. Due to Russia’s possible forthcoming accession to the World Trade Organization, the Democratic chairman of the US Senate Finance Committee, Max Baucus of Montana, and three other influential lawmakers addressed an open letter to the US trade representative, Ron Kirk. The senators acknowledged that since 1991 Russia has made significant progress in opening its economy, but demanded that prior to its accession to the WTO, Moscow must resolve a number of issues concerning the interests of US firms. Recall that the Jackson-Vanik amendment, adopted in 1974, was intended to encourage the free emigration of Soviet citizens. It prohibited preferential treatment in trade, government loans and loan guarantees. It also allowed discriminatory tariffs and fees. In the letter, the senators warned that the Jackson-Vanik amendment could remain in force unless Russia takes additional measures to protect intellectual property rights and allows duty-free import of information and communication technologies, which will benefit America’s high-tech companies. The lawmakers are demanding Russia opens its market to US agricultural producers, abolishes quotas and increased duties. Moreover, senators spoke in defense of auto companies, which are trying to achieve the removal of disadvantageous investment policies. Observers note that Russia’s forthcoming accession to the WTO has resulted in unhealthy agitation among Republican lawmakers. And they are not limiting their demands to purely economic requirements. Last week, the Republican speaker of the House, John Boehner of Ohio, criticized Russia. He warned that the House of Representatives would not support the abolition of the Jackson-Vanik amendment and permanent normalization of trade relations with Russia unless Moscow resolves its conflict with Georgia. Moreover, Boehner accused Moscow of being revanchist and trying to restore its Soviet-style influence. “Russia uses natural resources as a political weapon,” Boehner said at a speech at the Heritage Foundation. “And it plays ball with unstable and dangerous regimes. In Russia’s use of old tools and old thinking, we see nothing short of an attempt to restore Soviet-style power and influence.”

#### Nuclear war

Cohen 96 - Fellow @ Heritage

Ariel, “The New Great Game” accessed 8-24-2K5, online: http://www.heritage.org/Research/RussiaandEurasia/BG1065.cfm

Much is at stake in Eurasia for the U.S. and its allies. Attempts to restore its empire will doom Russia's transition to a democracy and free-market economy. The ongoing war in Chechnya alone has cost Russia $6 billion to date (equal to Russia's IMF and World Bank loans for 1995). Moreover, it has extracted a tremendous price from Russian society. The wars which would be required to restore the Russian empire would prove much more costly not just for Russia and the region, but for peace, world stability, and security. As the former Soviet arsenals are spread throughout the NIS, these conflicts may escalate to include the use of weapons of mass destruction. Scenarios including unauthorized missile launches are especially threatening. Moreover, if successful, a reconstituted Russian empire would become a major destabilizing influence both in Eurasia and throughout the world. It would endanger not only Russia's neighbors, but also the U.S. and its allies in Europe and the Middle East. And, of course, a neo-imperialist Russia could imperil the oil reserves of the Persian Gulf.15 Domination of the Caucasus would bring Russia closer to the Balkans, the Mediterranean Sea, and the Middle East. Russian imperialists, such as radical nationalist Vladimir Zhirinovsky, have resurrected the old dream of obtaining a warm port on the Indian Ocean. If Russia succeeds in establishing its domination in the south, the threat to Ukraine, Turkey, Iran, and Afganistan will increase. The independence of pro-Western Georgia and Azerbaijan already has been undermined by pressures from the Russian armed forces and covert actions by the intelligence and security services, in addition to which Russian hegemony would make Western political and economic efforts to stave off Islamic militancy more difficult. Eurasian oil resources are pivotal to economic development in the early 21st century. The supply of Middle Eastern oil would become precarious if Saudi Arabia became unstable, or if Iran or Iraq provoked another military conflict in the area. Eurasian oil is also key to the economic development of the southern NIS. Only with oil revenues can these countries sever their dependence on Moscow and develop modern market economies and free societies. Moreover, if these vast oil reserves were tapped and developed, tens of thousands of U.S. and Western jobs would be created. The U.S. should ensure free access to these reserves for the benefit of both Western and local economies.